A DISCOVRSE OPENING THE NATVRE OF THAT EPISCOPACIE, WHICH IS EXERCISED IN *ENGLAND*.

Wherein,

With all Humility, are represented some Considerations tending to the much-desired Peace, and long expected Reformation, of This our Mother Church.

The Second Edition, Corrected and Enlarged.

By the Right Honourable ROBERT LORD BROOKE.

LONDON,
Printed by *R. C.* for *Samuel Cartwright*, and are to be sold at the signe of the Hand and Bible in *Ducke-Lane*. 1642.

TO THE MOST NOBLE LORDS, WITH THE HONORABLE KNIGHTS, CITIZENS, AND BURGESSES, Now assembled in PARLIAMENT.

IN Epistles Dedicatory, sometimes men render an account to the world, by what Principles they were Led to such a worke Sometimes they maintaine and strengthen, what they have done, by New Arguments. Some-

times *ad captandam Benevolentiam*, they preſent their whole Deſigne, in a briefe Epitomy, that ſo they may invite the Reader. But I ſhall doe None of Theſe.

The firſt I *need not*: For if the Ten Kings muſt hate the *Whore*, Eate her fleſh, and Burne her with her fire; Will not every good Chriſtian offer himſelfe a ready Servant to This Worke, a Willing Souldier under this Standard?

The Second, I *cannot*; without queſtioning my owne Diligence, or (which is worſe) my Readers Gentleneſſe: Either of which every Writer carefully ſhunneth.

The third I *will not*, leſt I be injurious to my ſelfe: For, Humane Nature is ever *Novorum avida*; and the Soule of yaſt comprehenſion; the Booke therefore would ſeeme but *Crambe bis cocta*, to All that read the Epiſtle; and but create a *nauſea* to Thoſe that had already gathered all, by viewing the Breviate.

If it be the Glory of a King's Daughter to be clothed in *Needle-worke*; ſurely This poore

poore Birth will need more then *Fig-leaves*, to make it Beautifull. When it is Cloathed with its Beſt Robes, It will not be worthy to appeare in ſo Great a Preſence. How much leſſe then, when preſented only in a bare and naked *Sceleton*?

The Worke then of Theſe Lines, is to lay proſtrate at Your Feet (moſt Noble Lords, and Gentlemen) the *Retirements* of Your Humble Servant in the Laſt *Receſſe*.

If You ſhall aske mee, how I dare take the boldneſſe to interrupt Your more ſerious Thoughts, with Theſe Things of Little Worth: All I ſhall plead for my ſelfe is but This, the bow muſt be ſometimes unbent; and if then This Pamphlet may be called for, it is all I aſpire to. For, Your Protection, and Your Patronage, not Your Trouble, is My Requeſt: Of which being no whit Doubtfull; with all Humility commen-

ding This to Your Noble Favour; Your selves and Counsels to the Almighty; I crave leave for ever to remaine

Your most obliged and

devoted Servant

ROBERT BROOKE.

THE

The Contents of the Sections, and Chapters, in the following Discourse.

Section. I.

Sheweth, What is that *Episcopacy* that is fought against; and how incongruous it is to *State-policy*.

Chap. I

The *Subject Stated. Not a Bishops* Name, *but* Office *Opposed: nor* Office *in* generall, *but Such. Such a Bishop repugnant to* State-Policie; Antiquity; Scripture. *The Method propounded for the first Section, containing Arguments drawne from* State-Policie. fol. 1.

Chap. II. *Of Our Bishops* Birth: *how unsuitable to his* Office: *how Hurtfull to Himselfe and Others: How incongruous to* State-Policie. 3

III. *A Bishops* Breeding *not fit for his* Calling: *against Rules of Policie. Some Objections answered.* 5

IV. *Of Our Bishops* Election; *whether suitable to* State-Policie. *Of his* Office: Principles, *or* Maximes, *by which hee governeth: and* Practice *according to Those* Principles. 10

V. *Of the Nature of* Indifference; *what it is: and in what it hath place: whether* in Re, *or onely in* Appearance *to our* Understandings. 17

VI. *Where the* Power *of* Indifferent *Things seemes to be fixed: whether in the* Church, *or not: or if in the Church, How farre. Of the Churches Deciding Commanding Power. Of* Doubts, *and how we must deport our selves under* Doubts. 27

VII. *Of the* Consequents *to a Bishops Office. His Relations Upward and Dependances. Of his* Vote *in* Parliament. *Relations Downward: How repugnant to* State Policie. 32

VIII. *What* Good *our Bishops can do to the* State, *is examined. whether they have beene, or can be, friends to* Monarchy, *or* Civill *Government.* 38

IX. *How suitable such* Episcopacie *can be to* Monarchy, *is farther considered. Whether the Best forme of Church Government*

ment be Monarchicall. *Whether other Formes may not well ſtand with* Civill Monarchy. *How* Church *and* State *Government differ and agree.* 44

X. *Who it is that oppoſeth, and exalteth himſelfe above all that is called* God. *Who is properly a* Papiſt: *and what is* Popery: *Why the* Pope *is moſt properly* Antichriſt: *How ſuch* Epiſcopacy *differs, or agrees with* Popery. 49

SECTION II.

Conſidereth how Conſonant ſuch *Epiſcopacy* is either to ſound *Antiquity* or *Scripture*.

Chap. I. *Some Antiquities produced by a late moſt Learned and Reverend Patron of* Epiſcopacie, *are diſcuſſed.* 65

II. *Our Biſhops* Election, Delegation, &c. *Examined by* Antiquity. 69

III. *Of* Ordination, *whether proper onely to* Biſhops: *or equally committed to all* Presbyters: *diſcuſſed by Ancient Authorities.* 72

IV. *Of the* Name *and* Office *of a* Biſhop *in* Scripture. *How little, or how much the Scripture makes* for, *or* againſt *Biſhops, Diverſe Texts are diſcuſſed.* 74

V. *What forme of Church Government ſeemes moſt conſonant to* Scripture. *Whether* Monarchicall, Ariſtocraticall, *or* Democraticall. 79

VI. *Of the conſequents that may poſſibly follow the change of Church Government. Of the great danger of Schiſmes, Sects and Hereſies. Of* One new Sect *to come in the Laſt Dayes. Whether Biſhops can keepe the Church from Schiſmes, Sects, &c. What is, or who are the* Cauſe *of moſt* Schiſmes *among us.* 84

VII. *The danger of* Schiſmes *and* Sects *more fully diſcuſſed: the Nature and Danger of* Anabaptiſme, Separatiſme, *and* Unlicenſed Preaching. *The concluſion, with an affectionate deſire of peace and union.* 95

ERRATA.

PAge 6. line 10. for *our* r. *their*, p. 73. l. 39. for *Prelyter*, r. *Preſbyter*, p. 87. l. 13. for *thengh* r. *though*, p. 97. l. 22. for *letting* r. *ſetting*.

A

DISCOVRSE OPENING THE NATVRE OF THAT *EPISCOPACY* WHICH IS EXERCISED IN *ENGLAND*:

Wherein with all humility, are represented some Considerations tending to the much-desired Peace, and long expected Reformation, of this our Mother Church.

SECT. I.

Sheweth, what is that *Episcopacy* that is fought against; and how incongruous it is to *State-Policy*.

CHAP. I.

The Subject Stated. Not a Bishops Name, *but* Office *Opposed*: *nor* Office *in* generall, *but Such. Such a Bishop repugnant to* State-Policie; Antiquity, Scripture. *The Method propounded for the first Section, containing Arguments drawne from* State-Policie.

I Ayme not at *Words*, but *Things*; not loving to fight with *Shadowes*. It is not the *Looke*, much lesse the *Name* of a Bishop that I feare, or quarrell with; it is his *Nature*, his *Office*, that displeaseth me.

Nor yet his Nature, or Office in Generall; but *Such*, and so

cloathed, or rather veiled, with such and such adjuncts.

1. For to me the Word *Bishop* signifies, either one that is to Preach, Administer the Sacraments, Exhort, Reprove, Convince, Excommunicate, &c. not onely in some one distinct Congregation, his owne *Parish*; but in many, severall Congregations crowded up together in one strange (and, for long, unknowne) word, a *Diocesse*.

2. Or one who hath to all this added, not onely the name of a Civill Lord, (with which bare name or shadow, I fight not) but also a vast, unweldy (I had almost said unlimited) Power in *Civill Government*; which must needs draw on a mighty Traine, and cloath it selfe with glorious Robes of long extended and magnifique stiles, scarce to be marshall'd by a better Herauld than *Elihu*, who could give no Titles.

3. Or in the last place, (which should be first) a true faithfull *Overseer*, that, over one single Congregation, hath a joynt care with the Elders, Deacons, and rest of the Assembly, who are all fellow-helpers, yea servants each to others faith.

This *last* is a *Bishop*, of the *first* Institution; of Christs allowance; setled in divers Churches, even in the Apostles times.

The *first* is of the *second Century*, when Doctrine, Discipline, all Religion, began to waine. For even then *Mysterious Antichrist* was not onely *conceived*, but began to *quicken*.

The *second* rose *last*, (though *first* intended by the Churches Enemy.) Rising up while the world was busie, looking all one way; as amaz'd at the new Beast, successour to the Dragon.

This is now our *Adversary*; One monstrously compounded, of different, yea opposite Offices; and those the greatest, both *Ecclesiasticall* and *Civill*: for which he seemes no way able, no way fit; and that for many reasons, which may bee brought from *Scripture*, *Church-Antiquity*, *State-Policy*.

I shall beginne with the last, (as that I now ayme at most.) Here let us view our Bishop a while as a private man, *before his Office*. Next as a Lord over Church and State, *in his Office*. Then with some necessary *Consequents to his Office*; as now it is exercised in this Kingdome. Thus shall we quickely judge how sutable to true *Policy of State*, are either the *Antecedents*, *Concomitants*, or *Consequents*, of this too officious, two-headed *Bishop*.

Antece-

Antecedents to his Office, are his *Birth*, *Education*, *Election*, *Ordination*, &c.

Concomitants, (or rather *Ingredients*) we may call, that almost illimited power, both *Intensive*, in sole Ordination; Jurisdiction (*Directive*; by Injunctions, Canons, &c. *Corrective*, by Excommunication, Suspension, Deprivation, &c.) As also *Extensive*, over so vast a *Diocesse*.

Hither also we may referre his power *Juridicall* or Legislative, in Parliament; Judiciall in many great, yea Civill Tribunals. And (of all monsters most ugly) his power *Delegative*: then which this sunne hath seene nothing more monstrous, at least as of late it hath beene exercis'd.

By *Consequents* I meane his *Relations*, (acquired by his office) both *Upward*, to his Soveraigne, Creator, Benefactors; as *Downward*, to his owne family, Creatures, and hang-by Dependants.

CHAP. II.

Of our Bishops Birth, *how unsuitable to his* Office: *how Hurtfull to Himselfe and Others*: *How incongruous to* State-Policie.

LEt us begin with *Antecedents*; in them the first. Which we shall finde very unsuitable to his after acquired office. For the most part he is *Ex fœce plebis*; *humi-serpent*; of the lowest of the people (an old complaint.) Now for such a low borne man, to be exalted high, so high, and that not *gradatim*, step by step, but *per saltum*, all at once, as oft it is (in one of few, or no Schoole Degrees; which yet indeed at best are scarce degrees to the Civill honour of a Peere;) must needes make as great a *Chasme* in *Politiques*, as such *leapes* use to doe in *Naturals*.

A great Evill must it be, and that both *in himselfe*, and *to himselfe* from *others*.

In *others* eye, his honour will be the object, not so much perhaps of envy, as scorne: while every man of lowest worth, will still value himselfe at as high a rate, and still conceive he wanted not the *vertuous desert*, but *fortunate reward*, a Bishop

had. Now every Action will from hence diſpleaſe, ſith unexpected, ſudden happineſſe, is oft times *fault enough.*

Now that fitting deportment, which may but expreſſe the juſt dignity of his place, and anſwer the majeſty of his high calling, ſhall be eſteem'd but pride, inſolence, and at beſt but affectation. And from ſome ſuch diſpleaſing action, or geſture, (though but ſurmis'd on ſome groundleſſe fancy) oft his very perſon comes to be diſtaſted: and then adieu all effectuall good, which his words or actions, elſe, might ſoone effect.

Sure the chiefe Dominion of Goſpell Miniſters ſhould be in That, the Lord and maſter of the Goſpell ſo much requires; *My ſonne, give me thy heart.* If a Miniſter once come to loſe the heart, and affections of his people, he may indeed ſtudy ſome way to force their bodies; but ſhall ſcarſe ever winne a ſoule, or ſave a ſinner. *Homo duci vult, cogi non poteſt*, man may be led, but cannot be compelled: if you can faſten any *force* on his whole perſon, it muſt be that of *Love.* For ſure the Goſpell conſtraint, is onely that of *Love. The love of Chriſt conſtraineth.* This, and this only is an irreſiſtible Attractive, an uncontroulable conſtraint. Thus is the Miniſter, the *Biſhop* hurt, in regard of Others.

In regard of *Himſelfe*: ſudden great changes are dangerous in Nature: the skilfull Graſier, the expert Gardiner, will not tranſlate from barren to an over-fruitfull ſoile; for this ſuffocates the Spirits, and deſtroyes the Plant. The ſudden unexpected newes of a ſonnes life, (which was reported dead) was the death of the Parent, as we read in Roman Hiſtories.

High places cauſe a ſwimming in the braine: your Faulkners teele a Pigeons eye, (when they would have her ſoare high) to prevent a *vertigo.* I conceive from this Reaſon, and mainely from this, it was the good pleaſure of the Spirit, that under the Law, when the Church had an influence into ſtate-affaires, the High Prieſt ſhould be choſen out of one eminent family, of the ſtocke of *Levi*: and ſome of the Kings of *Iſrael* are reproved by God, for that they choſe their Prieſts out of the meaneſt of the people. He that is to goe in and out before the people, and is their guide, muſt be without blemiſh.

Thoſe Horſes which are deſigned to a loſty Ayre, and gene-

rous

rous manage, muſt be of a Noble race. *Non bene conveniunt, nec in una ſede morantur, Majeſtas & Origo plebeia,* Majeſty, and a Baſe Originall, doe not well ſuite; neither can they dwell together: The Vapours which by the Sun are raiſed to a great height, even to the ſecond Region, being of ſo meane a Progeny, are but the matter of haile, ſnow, raine, ſtorme, and tempeſt, which by Hiſtorians are obſerv'd to be the frequent Prognoſtickes, or at leaſt companions of Wars, and confuſions.

CHAP. III.

A Biſhops Breeding *not fit for his* Calling: *againſt Rules of Policy. Some Objections anſwered.*

BUt ſome will ſay, this defect (in *Birth*) may be repaired in *Breeding*, elſe we ſhut the doores of hope, (and by Conſequence of *Induſtry*) to *Cicero*, *Marius*, and ſuch other Worthies; who though but of a low Pedegree, may advance themſelves even to the Helmé, and there approve themſelves men admirable, in the way of Government.

'Tis true, *Art* oft-times helpeth *Nature*: ſome men of ſmall beginnings, by their vertues have deſerved for a Motto, and Impreſo, the Poets words, —— *Et quæ non fecimus ipſi,*
Vix ea noſtra voco ——

That which is not of our owne doing, we can ſcarce call our owne. But when was this ſeene in a Biſhop?

Let us therefore in the next place, examine their *Breeding*; and ſee whether in probability, that be not as diſadvantagious to their Office, as their *Birth*.

Our Education, (if we intend ſervice in way of Civill Policie) muſt be in converſe with thoſe who are therein *Arts Maſters*: or in reading their writings: or laſtly, and mainely, in an happy *uſe* of both. Neither of the two former, hardly both together, can make us ſo expert, as Practice. *Scribendo diſcimus ſcribere.* Long, Active, coſtly, and dangerous Obſervations, are the onely way to make a wiſe Statef-man.

Now when theſe Gentlemen, I meane, the moſt refined wits amongſt them, (for others come not within our queſtion;)

desigue the Ministeriall Function, they either lay aside *Divinity*, and so God is displeased: or else they labour seriously in the more spirituall pathes; and then the Common Weale is by them deserted. For, these two (so different) studies cannot goe forward *pari passu*, with equall progresse. A Minister cannot serve *God* and *Mammon*.

I know other men thinke otherwise, (of these Studies) but I conceive the case is cleare: For sure the complaints of good men, Canons and Acts of Councels, (forbidding Ministers to meddle in State affaires) and the Answers of our owne breasts prove this truth more then sufficiently.

You shal have St. *Austin* (in his 81. *Epist.*) complaining that worldly affaires distracted his thoughts from his calling: and St. *Cyprian* apprehends, those great persecutions were but just consequences of the Clergies guilt in this kinde. *Gregory* the great was much troubled to feele himselfe under that load.

Secondly, Canons and Councels discover their judgements fully in this point; so *Can.* 6. 8. and 83. of the Apostles. *Councels* also doe the same; *Con. Carthag. Can.* 16. *Conc. Calced. Can.* 3. and thus still they did while Canons and Councels did at all study the advancement of Christs Kingdome.

I confesse of later times, Ministers (like Water-men) have looked one way, and row'd another; so that perhaps now you may finde Canons of another straine.

But thirdly, (which may answer all Objections) let every good Minister examine but his owne breast, his owne heart; and then let him speake.

I am sure, to those who maintaine such Prelaticall Bishops, this absurdity will follow; that to one man the whole power may be given, both *in Civilibus, & Ecclesiasticis*: a Thing, which God thought Christ *one'y* fit for; and so on His shoulders only, did he place the Worlds Government.

Objct. Yet some will perhaps affirme, Both these compatible, and this by example from Gods owne Injunctions, to some of the Ministers, under the Law, in the Jewish Policy.

Answ. 1. But I answer, first, There are Two maine things in which our Ministery, and the Jewes (of old) doe differ.

First, all their solemne externall worship, (at least most part of it) lay in Bodily Worke, in such things wherein the mind and

and braine was but little exercised; as in offering Sacrifice, burning Incense, divers washings, &c.

Secondly, That which made their members uncapable of comming into their assemblies, was outward uncleanesse, (as touching of a dead body, Leprosie, want of Legall washings, &c.) and from hence their Ministeriall watch (one of the greatest workes) became as Easy, as Outward and Visible; so that even of the inferiour Levites, were made *Porters*; and to these, the Office of restraining unmeet persons, from their Congregation, did belong.

But, now, the Work of our Ministers under Christ, differeth *toto Cælo*; and that both in publique and private.

In publique, it is Preaching, Expounding, Catechising, &c. which require mighty workings of the braine, and inward man: specially sith these must be done with Majesty and Authority; (*Let no man despise thy youth*) and yet with all sweetnesse and gentlenesse, (*for a Bishop must not be fierce.*)

In private, his Worke is to compose differences, (that they breake not out into publique) to visit the sicke, to comfort the afflicted, (for *Who is sicke* (saith *Paul*) *and I am not troubled? who is weake or offended, and I burne not?*) Yea, and many more works of this Nature. And all this, besides the care of his Family, and besides his private study, a worke too great for any man.

If you then consider the quantity, the variety, or spirituality, of the Ministeriall Worke under the Gospell; you cannot but acknowledge it great, very great, and much greater than that of old under the Law. Indeed they dispute sometimes, who have not tryed; but a painfull Preacher still cryeth out, *Who is sufficient, who is fit, for these things?*

In the Censures of the Church (though indeed the *Keyes* be entrusted with others as well as himselfe, yet) by his learning, piety, and prudence, he must steere all: so that he must alwayes be awake. *Caveat Dictator nequid detrimenti capiat Respublica*, Let the Dictatour take heed, that the Common-wealth sustaine no losse.

Will any man now say, that the Case of a Priest, and a Minister, is all one? for, suppose the Priests of old, did intermeddle with secular affaires, shall any Minister now from this example, (when the calling is so vastly different) take upon him

him *both* functions? If he doe, let him take heed he be not as one that hath taken up the Plough of the Kingdome of Heaven, and then doth the worke of the Lord negligently: If so, his judgement will be intolerable.

Answ. 2. But, in the second place, I answer confidently, and I hope truely, that these *two* Offices, or Callings, did not under the Law meete in *One*, except in some *Extraordinary* Cases, and persons.

First, the old Patriarchs, I confesse, did exercise *Both Functions*, in some sense, and in some sense they did not: (I meane as a *Calling*.) *Abraham* indeed swayed the Scepter; but his whole Kingdome was limited to his owne Family; and so he was a King, and no King; for every Master of a Family, must in the like case keepe up Government.

I confesse he offered Sacrifice; but then, when there was no Law, no Priest: and others might have done it as well as He, had they beene so well inclined. Thus he was a Priest, and no Priest; for in his Priestly Office, he did but what every good man would doe; at least might have done: and in his Kingly Office, he was but as a Master of a Family. And so it was in the rest of the Patriarches; so that little can be urged from these examples. To which may also be referr'd, that old instance of *Melchisedech*; if at least he were a man, and not the Second Person of the Trinity, in mans forme; as *Cunæus*, *Molineus*, and many others hold.

Secondly, I find Two Judges that were High-Priests also; *Samuel* and *Ely*: but it seemes they were thus, by some expresse, particular, Extraordinary Command: for God saith to *Samuel*, *These have not rejected Thee, but Me*: intimating that he had particularly appointed him to judge, as in an Extraordinary Case, which may therefore be no president for Ordinary men, in Ordinary Cases. *Samuels* speciall calling appeares not onely from his being devoted before his Birth, and strange call of God, after: but most clearely in that he was not (as all the Priests were to be) of *Aarons* house; as appeares by 1 *Sam* 1. Compared with 1 *Chron.*6. Yea, and *Ely* too, though of *Aaron*, yet was not of the eldest sonne; (whose Line by right ought to have had the High-Priesthood) as the Jewes discourse at large; and of late *Cloppenburge*, in his Excellent *Schoole* of Sacrifice.

Now

Now *Hosea* may by speciall Licence take a wife of Adulteries; *Abraham* Sacrifice his childe; the Jewes borrow Jewels of the Ægyptians, and *Phineas* doe justice by an extraordinary command or instinct, but we may not follow these presidents.

Some say that inferiour *Levites* did intermeddle in secular affaires. But I answer, there were *Levites* of two sorts; out of one sort, *Priests* were chosen, (out of *Aarons* Line,) the others were like the *Seculars* among the *Jesuites*. And these last did (as the Seculars doe) performe the *Civill* part of those *Religious* Services; and nothing else, that I can finde in Scripture or Story.

Lastly, for the High Priests after the Jewish Government was broken in pieces, I hope no body will bring them for a president: there being then no Vision for spirituall things from God, no more Government for Civill things, according to the Rule of God.

Of those times *Josephus* complaineth, that the *Chasmonei* had taken upon them the Uniting of *Priest-hood* and *Secular power*, in one person; which could not be done, but in extraordinary cases, by Gods speciall command. And thus I suppose they will get but little from Gods injunctions among the Jewes.

But some still will say, that one of these Studies may fit for another. All truthes, *Polemicke*, *positive*, whether Politique, Philosophicall, or Theologicall, are of neere consanguinity; and he that is a *Gnostique* in one, cannot be a meere *Tyrunculus* in the other. *Object.*

I confesse did they improve their Studies to the ripening of Reason, and inlarging of their understanding, This might in some sense be true. But they spend their time in Criticall, Cabalisticall, Scepticall, Scholasticall Learning: which fils the head with empty, aeriall, notions; but gives no sound food to the Reasonable part of man. Yea their study is mainly laid out upon bookes, which they prize, and sleight as they please; while they want, *Cotem Scientiæ & ingenii*, the Whetstone of Learning, and Wit, A Reall Adversary, that by contradiction might raise their Parts, and much inlarge their judgements. Their learning is in *Termes*, it is but *Nominall*; *Answ.* 1.

nall; and waters cannot rise higher then their Fountaine.

Answ. 2. But allow that they improve their studies to be best; yet this is not enough: For, State Policy is the Daughter of Converse, Observation, Industry, Experience, Practice; and Bookes will never *Teach* That: but They are but ill Leaders of the Blinde, and what will be the issue in that Case, judge you.

CHAP. IV.

Of our Bishops Election; *whether suitable to* State-Policie. *Of his* Office: Principles, *or* Maximes, *by which he governeth*: *and* Practice *according to Those* Principles.

WE have seene our Bishops *Birth*, and *Breeding*, with all his Studies, and preparations to his Office; to which we have now brought him; onely that his *Election*, and *Ordination* Interpose. Of which I might speake much; but because This is the common Theame of all complaints, I shall passe it here; the rather because it may perhaps be better examined by *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, than *State-Policie*, in which I now am.

Yet by the way I cannot but propose it as worthy of State consideration; how like the inferiour Clergie is to yeeld true *Canonicall Obedience*, to one (that *nescio quo jure*, requires it by *Oath*) though he be oft forc'd on them against, and never with, their expresse will; which they cannot expresse, having neither positive, nor negative votes in election. Except perchance the whole Clergie of a *Diocesse* or *Province*, may be fully represented by a Cloistred Chapiter, among which are usually the very dregges of lowest men. Who yet indeede (themselves) have no Elective votes; but after the solemne dirge of *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, are as sure to finde the Spirit in a *Conge d' eslire*, as others not long since, in the Tridentine Post-mantile.

Certainely, it is to be desired, that Christians would shew as much care and conscience in setting heads over whole Churches, as some Heathen Emperours did in setting Governours

vernours over private Townes; which yet they would not doe, till at least free liberty was given to the Citizens complaint and rejection, if not Election, of the party propounded. And this *Antoninus* learnt from the Jewes, and Christians choyce of *Their* Church Governours in *Those* Times, though now Latter ages are growne Wiser. But I must leave this *Subject*.

We are now come to view our Bishop *in his Office*. Though we may complaine (as one once of *Lewes* the 11.) he cannot be fairely limn'd, because still in *Motion*: which yet in it selfe might be, at least excusable; were he not *nimium Diligens*, too officious; being made up of Two most inconsistent Offices, the one of *Church*, the other of *State*.

His deportment in *Both*, we may guesse by his *Maximes* or *Rules* by which he goes, which once seene, we shall quickly perceive how well he squares his *Practise* by his *Principles*: and how consonant both to true Church or State-Policie.

I shall instance but in one or two, for we may know *Ex ungue Leonem*, the Lion by his paw. The *Climax* runs up thus.

First, the Church hath power in all Indifferents.

Secondly, the Church is Judge what is Indifferent.

Thirdly, the Bishops (and their Creatures) are This Church.

If a Prince hath power to Command the persons and estates of his Subjects in case of *Necessity*, and the same Prince be sole judge of *Necessity*; it will be no wonder to me, if That People be ever *Necessitous*.

If the Church have power *in Adiaphoris*, in Indifferent things, and the same Church be Judge *Quid sit Adiaphoron*, what is Indifferent; and this Church be the *Bishops*; I shall not wonder to see those things that are purely *Indifferent*, made *absolutely necessary*, to the insupportable burden of all mens consciences.

Object. But some will perhaps say, *These Maximes* have influence onely into *Church* Government, and so belong not to the present question of *State-Policie*.

Answ. I confesse, did they confine the pressing of these, within the confines of the *Church*, they could not so properly belong to the dispute in hand: but they run over; for the *Maxime* is very

large. It is not onely Indifferent things in the *Church*, but Indifferent things in generall, *All Indifferent things*; and so they may take in, what they will.

Againe, they doe really set Lawes in *State* matters, under the notion of Indifferent; so that all the *Subjects Liberty*, or propriety in goods, *They* compasse with their *Net* of *Indifferencie*; which they make heavie with the plummets of greatest penalties.

Yea, though they medled not at all, with such Things as these, without their *Horizon*; yet if they make those Things to be *Indifferent* which are *sinfull*, (as they doe, I feare) and to These *inforce obedience* with pretence of *Church Policy*, They overthrow all *Civill* Government.

I take such *Maximes*, to be the very *Hinges* upon which our Bishops Practice turneth. I shoote not Arrowes of Scorne: For truly I have not in my intentions, either by flouts, or jeeres, or by a factious Spirit, to deale with *This* Adversary. *Michael* himselfe would not *revile* the *Devill*: It much lesse becomes me, so to behave my selfe towards *These* Men (with whom I treat) among whom I know so many truly Eminent: I desire to speake nothing but Truth. Yea, I should exceedingly rejoyce, if by the Spirit of Meekenesse, men of that Learning, and abilities, (which many of them are) might be reduced to That, which I from my Soule conceive to be truth, and am perswaded will be so acknowledged by Themselves, one day.

If these then be their *Tenets*, (as I suppose they will confesse them to be) Is there any thing more *Unreasonable*; more *Unbrotherly*: more savouring of *Selfe*, than These *Positions*?

Unreasonable; For, allow the *Church* hath all power in *Indifferents*, (which I dare not yet yeeld, who hath made the *Church* a *Judge* (beyond appeale) *what is Indifferent*? Is not this, to bring *necessary* and *indifferent* things all under one notion, If the Church shall judge *indifferent* things to be *necessary*, and *necessary* to be indifferent? which would to me be a sad story.

But you will say, if the Church be not the Judge of what is *Indifferent*; who may be That Judge?

I tell you, asking of questions is no answering of difficulties

But secondly, (because I love to deale plainely) I will tell

you

you who shall be Judge: In expounding of Scripture, the *Scripture*; but in finding out what is *indifferent*, *Recta Ratio* right reason, must be Judge.

But who shall tell us what is *Recta Ratio?* I answer, *Recta Ratio*. Will any man, if the Church shall judge That to be *indifferent*, which is not, say it is indifferent? or that my conscience is bound in this case? *Ex. grat.* I doe confesse the *houre* when the Congregation shall meet, is *indifferent*; if the Church will appoint hereupon *Eleven* of the Clock at night, and *Five* in the morning (in this *Latitude* under which we are) I hope no man will say but that it is ill done of the Church; and that neither my conscience, nor my outward man, is bound further in *This*, than to a *passive* obedience; certainely all force upon me, in this case, would be sinne in them.

But they will say, this is a thing in its selfe *Unreasonable*, and so commeth not into the nature of *indifferent* thing. *Object.*

But the Church having such power, as is claimed, who may dispute it? *Answ.*

But secondly, this action must be considered either in the universall nature of it, or else as it is presently to be put in practise. If you value and ballance it in this last sense, nothing is indifferent, no substantiall, nor circumstantiall Being. For we being bound to doe That, which *hic & nunc*, in this particular, and for the present, is best, *That* which is so with the circumstances, will be our guide, and the Church will have, can have, no power against *This*.

But if you consider things in the universall nature, (not cloathed with these and these circumstances) then it seemeth to have some *Indifferencie*; and then, if ever, it is in the *Churches* power; and yet even then, the *Church* can goe no further, than what will be according to *Reason*. For, for a Church to say, I will, because *I will*, is most *Papall*, Tyrannicall, and altogether displeasing to Christ: but of This, more in another place.

Thus their Tenets seeme to me very *Unreasonable*; They will doe more than *Adam* did: He gave *Names* to Things according to their Natures; they will give *Natures* according to their owne fancies.

Secondly, very *Unbrotherly*; in that they make themselves

the *Church*, excluding all others: in which act, according to their Tenets) they exclude all others from Salvation; for they say, in an ordinary way, there is no Salvation out of the Church; and they in this, admit none into the Church, but themselves.

Moses was, upon a mistake, reproved by the Jewes, in that he made himselfe a *Judge*, though in that decision he released a Jew. Truly I know not by what authority these *Bishops* stile themselves the representative Church; for they must doe it either *Jure humano*, or *Divino*. By the *last* we doe not yeeld; That is the Question in hand: by the *first* they cannot; for where doe the people, either implicitely or explicitely, elect them, and resigne up their power to them?

Is it in their *Convocation*, that they obtaine this priviledge? That, by the Lawes of this Land, is not at all obligatory till confirmed by *Parliament*.

Secondly, the *people* choose not *These* Convocation men, but the *Clergy*, and so they cannot represent the whole Church.

Thirdly, the Clergie have no *free election*, for the Bishop will appoint whom they must choose; and this too *Sub pœna anathematis*, under the penalty of Excommunication.

The *Angels* (for the whole Ministery of the Church) in the *Revelation*, seeme to receive some particular honour from the Spirit; yet not the power of a *Representative Body*: but *Quo jure humano, aut Divino*, Twenty Exe men shall challenge to themselves, as *proper*, That which is not so much as by a *figurative* right, given to those Angels, I know not. And is not this *Unbrotherly*, to intrude my selfe, and exclude all others from *Their Right*?

But lastly it savoureth very much of *Selfe*. For certainely he that will out-doe the *Pope*, is growne to a pretty height of *pride*. Now in the Papacie it is a dispute, whether the Pope alone; or the whole *Colledge* of *Cardinals*; or a generall *Councell*; or the *People*; or *All* These; or *Some* of These, with their joynt forces, may stile themselves the *Church*. But *Our men* without dispute, (like the *Lion* in the Fable) challenge *All*: of whom the Poet is verified; *Ætas patrum, pejor avo, tulit progeniem nequiorem*, the Age of our Fathers, being worse than that of our Grandfathers, hath yet brought forth a more wicked

wicked progeny. And yet, whoever takes up Errour at the Second hand, will have an ill bargaine, though hee buy it cheap; he will be no gainer. Errour being like the *Jeruſalem-Artichoake*; plant it where you will, it over-runnes the ground and choakes the Heart.

Thus having with the chaines of *Indifferency* bound up the Peoples *Liberty*; they deale no better with their *Prince*. Onely *Polyphemus*-like, they leave *Vlyſſes* for the laſt. For, when the People are devoured, Kings cannot eſcape. But becauſe Kings are of more prying Spirits, they ſteale in upon them, with Sugared Baites: ſuch as That of Theirs, *No Biſhop, No King*. But of this more anon.

I might inſtance in many other of their *Maximes*, which I conceive very prejudiciall, both to *Church*, and *State-Policy*. But I will rather view their *Practiſe*, according to Theſe *Principles* of *Indifferency*. In this I ſhall be very ſhort, not meaning to upbraid them with many monſtrous miſcarriages of late; the rather, becauſe I am confident that God, his Majeſty, and *The* Parliament, will not permit them longer to tranſgreſſe in This height.

Onely I cannot but intreat you to obſerve, how by *Their Injunctions*, founded on *Thoſe Maximes*, They have impoſed as *neceſſary*, many things that are but *Indifferent*, ſome things that are *Vnlawfull*.

Firſt many Things but *Indifferent*, they have injoyned as *neceſſary*. Some to *Miniſters*, as Caſſockes, Gownes, Tippets, Hoods, Caps, Canonicall Coats, Blackes, and many other. Some to *People*, as ſitting with their hats off; Standing up at *Gloria Patri*, the *Goſpel*, and other parts of ſervice. Weighty matters indeed, for Grave, Learned, Holy, Reverend Divines, to ſpend their time and thoughts upon.

I might perhaps goe a little higher; though I muſt confeſſe in ſome other things (now preſt as *neceſſary*) They have had Authority above their owne (though I conceive, none for ſuch rigid impoſall;) I meane the Higheſt, granted by the whole repreſentative State Civill and Eccleſiaſticall: which yet (with all duty to that wombe which bare me, and *Thoſe* Breaſts *That* gave me ſuck) hath thought ſome things indifferent, which I could ſcarce ever apprehend ſuch: at leaſt as

of

of late they have beene enjoyned on greateſt penalties. It hath oft made my ſoule bleed, to ſee the greateſt ſinnes daily committed, without more than a paper check, (that I may not ſay countenanced) while thouſands muſt ſigh in private, with loſſe of eares, goods, eſtates, livings, liberty, all; onely for refuſall of Thoſe things, that at beſt can be but Indifferent.

But however theſe things may be in themſelves: ſure I am, our Biſhops have preſſed them not onely beyond the Lawes intention, but alſo much againſt the meaning of thoſe good men; who in the firſt *Reformation*, did (though perhaps erroneouſly) what Chriſt once lawfully permitted, in almoſt the ſame caſe; allowing a convenient Time for Buriall of thoſe Ceremonies, which yet appeared not *Mortiferæ*, deadly, though *Mortuæ*, dead.

Yea and ſome things *unlawfull*, by their owne power They have forced upon *Miniſter* and *People* under the maske of *Indifferent*.

On the *Miniſters*, the Reading of the Booke of *Sports*, (firſt invented by themſelves) that monſtrous and prodigious late *Oath*, with divers new *Canons*, not enjoyned by *Parliament*, or any other Legall authority. I might adde their bare bidding forme of Prayer, *Second Service* at the *Altar*, (though it could not be heard) an illegall Oath of *Canonicall* Obedience, (blind devotion) and a new forme of ſubſcription before Degrees, Orders, Inſtitutions, &c.

On *Them* and the *People*, placing the Communion Table *Altar-wiſe*; Railing it in; Bowing to it; Receiving at it, &c. For I will now paſſe over their moſt unchriſtian *Oath Ex Officio*, (fouler than the fouleſt dregges of that cruell *Inquiſition*) at one blow cutting aſunder all the nerves, not onely of *poſitive*, but *morall*, *naturall* Lawes; all which (being tender of the leaſt graine of mans liberty) have entruſted us with this *Univerſall* maxime, *Nemo tenetur ſe prodere*, No man is bound to betray himſelfe.

Thus it is manifeſt, their *Practice* is according to their *Principles*, towards the *People*. And they have no leſſe incroacht upon the *Crowne*.

Doe they not affirme, that in Civill Government, *Democracie*,

cracie, Aristocracie, Monarchy, are all lawfull: and that of These, severall people may (at first) chuse which they please. But for *Episcopacy*, 'tis still with them, onely *Jure Divino*: in which they seeme to affirme *Themselves* to stand upon a *surer* Rocke than *Kings*. In This they erre against much light, (I feare) But, God forgive them.

CHAP. V.

Of the Nature of Indifference; *what it is*: *and in what it hath place*: *whether* in Re, *or onely in* Appearance *to our* Understandings.

BUt that we may no longer be impos'd upon, by This principle of *Indifference*, give mee leave to discover my thoughts in these *two* particulars.

First, What is *Indifferent*.

Secondly, Where the *Power* of *Indifference* is fixt.

Some call those things *Indifferent* which are neither forbidden, nor commanded: but here they tell us onely what 'tis *not*, and *Negatives* make no *Definition*.

Those also who affirme that to be *Indifferent*, which may, or may not be done, leave us as much to seeke, as the former.

I must intreat the Reader to remember, that we are now upon *Morall beings*: where the Two maine *Ingredients*, *Matter*, and *Forme*, can be but *Metaphysically* Notionall, and therefore it will be hard to give an exact *Definition*: Seeing even in *Naturals* (whose matter *occurrit sensibus*, is subject to sense) 'tis difficult enough.

Before I assay to give the nature of it in a Definition, give me leave to present you with some kinde of *Etymology*.

In the word *Indifferent*, the preposition *In*, is (They say) purely *negative*, though in other compounds (as *incipere*, *inflammare*, *incitare*, *influere*, &c.) it beareth another sense, which they call *augmentative*. But in the word *Indifferent*, it must *deny* a *Difference*, as much as *non differens*.

But under favour of our learned *Critickes*, I doe not conceive that particle, in This place wholly *negative*. Nor can I thinke *Caninius*, *Martinius*, or other good Grammarians (when they call this preposition *privative*) intend to make it

wholly *negative*: but to *my* eye, to *my* ſenſe; in *ſuch*, and *ſuch* circumſtances.

When a *man* is ſaid to be *Imprudens*, *incautus*, or the like; we may not judge Him altogether *ſine prudentia*, *ſine cautela*: for *Animal Rationale* cannot be quite devoid of *theſe*. And therefore if we take *Imprudens* (in this propoſition, *Hic homo eſt imprudens*) in a pure negative ſenſe, the *Predicate* is deſtructive to the *Subject*. So that I dare not thinke our Anceſters and learned men would give *Epithets*, or make *Compoſitions* contrary to all reaſon.

Such Propoſitions are then thus farre *Negative*, as by way of figure, to deny any *caution*, any *prudence*, whereas indeed they muſt allow both; except in ſuch or ſuch a particular, ſuch or ſuch a ſenſe.

Such doubtleſſe is the ſenſe of this Prepoſition, in the word *Indifferent*: not purely *Non differens*, but in *ſuch*, or *ſuch* a reſpect, it *Differeth not*. Though in another reſpect, it may, and doth *Differ*; even from the very ſame Thing with which yet in other reſpects it *Differeth not*.

This Etymology I chuſe the rather, becauſe I ſee the Criticks, in all their Etymologies, love to give to each part (in the compoſition) a *Poſitive ſignification*. Which I cannot doe here, unleſſe I tranſlate *Indifferens*, *Differing*, and yet *not differing*: a ſenſe which alſo the *Greeke* word ἀδιάφορον will fully beare; For (if by other imployments I have not loſt the ſmattering once I had in that Tongue) the phraſe ſeemes beſt applyable to a *Medium*, that doth *not fully*, or *wholly*, *carry it ſelfe off* from *both* the *Extremes*, but *participates of either*.

Such an *Indifferent-difference* hath cleerly place in all thoſe *Naturals*, which betweene two poſitive *extremes* (ſuch as *Black* and *White*; *Hot* and *Cold*) have a poſitive *Medium*, *Participationis* (becauſe it participates of both extremes) and *Negationis* too, becauſe it is *neither*. This *Medium* is properly *Indifferent* to either *Extreme*; from which it *Differeth*, and yet it *Differeth not*: becauſe it is *neither* of the *Two Extremes*, yet *participates* of *Both*. Thus Lukewarme, as Warme, Differeth not from *Hot*, yet differeth as *Coole*; and therefore is *Indifferent*.

This ſenſe of *Indifferent*, being thus made good in *Naturals*; ſome would borrow and apply to *Morall*, *Theologicall Beings* alſo.

also. So that betweene *Good* and *Bad*, they fancy an *intermediate* Entity, neither *Good* nor *Bad*, but *Indifferent* to either. As once a *Moderator* in the Schooles, being to determine whether *Lucretia* did well in stabbing her selfe; seeing that Action Good in many respects, and Bad in as many more, concluded thus, *Nec bene fecit, nec male fecit, sed* Interfecit.

But I conceive, such *Indifference*, will not, cannot be found in *Morals*, as it is in *Naturals*. The reason is, because the two *extremes* are not here (as in many *Naturals*) Both *Positive Beings*; so that a *Medium* may really participate of *Both*. *White* and *Blacke* indeed are *Both positives*, but so is not *Evill*; but only the privation of *Good*, which is the other extreme.

Moralists dispute how *Passions* are *Indifferent*, but they are put on great straites; and limit it onely to passions *in specie* (indeed only in a *Notion*) which yet *in sensu composito* cannot be said to be ever *Both Good* and *Bad*, or *neither Good* nor *Bad*, but being still *Good Naturally*, may be morally either *Good*, or *Bad*, *in individuo*, but *in sensu diviso*, not *Composito*.

For the same individuall action, or passion (in man) cannot be said both *Good* and *Bad* (take it in *actu exercito*) in the same respects; yea, if in any *One* morall respect, it be *truely Bad*, it cannot at all be said to be *properly Good*. For an *Error* or *Defect* in any one *Morall* (though but so much as a *Circumstance*) truely denominates the *whole action Evill*; but onely a perfect and universall concatenation of all essentials and circumstantials too, denominates it *Good*. Even as in *Logicke*, any one negative proposition makes the *whole Syllogisme* such; when to an *Affirm'd* Syllogisme, every part must be affirm'd. So 'tis in *Morals* too. And hence perhaps the old Stoickes affirm'd, *Omnia peccata* to be *paria*, all sinnes to be equall. Which is one of *Tullies Paradoxes*: because, saith he, *One* Steppe *beside* the *Line*, may as truely be said to be a *Transgression*, as a *thousand*, or running a thousand miles from it. It is well observed by *Aquinas*, that as a Body is not perfectly set *in suo bene esse naturali*, in its Naturall well-being, by a bare *forme* without *Accidents*; so neither an Act *in bene esse morali*, in its Morall well-being, by onely *object* and *end*, rightly fixed: except also every *Morall circumstance*, of time, place, &c. rightly concurre.

They who will have our *Vertues* equally *distare ab extremis*,

distant from the extremes, are much more in the right, than they who will have an *Indifferent* thing (speaking of *Morals*) to *partake* of *Both extremes*. Indeed *Vertue* flying from one *extreame*, when it is rancountred with an equall *Evill*, is arrest in *medio*; as *Iron* when accoasted by two *Loadstones* of equall vertue on either side, not daring to embrace *either*, hovereth *in medio*, betweene *Both*. Or as the *Magneticall needle* about the *Azores*, keepeth it selfe directly parallell to the *Axis* of the world; and admitteth no *variation*: because *in medio*, betweene the two great *Continents* (of *Europe* and *America*) to which some great Philosophers ascribe the *Magneticall* vertue, with better reason perhaps than others did, before, to the *Northerne* Pole, or *Northerne* Climates.

From all these premises, we will now assay to draw some conclusions, that may helpe us in judging what may be *Indifferent*.

First, it must be in it selfe *Good, wholly good*. For, if it have but one dram of *Evill*, it is wholly *Bad* (as was proved before) and so not *Indifferent*. We have found the *Genus* of it; it is *Good, Lawfull*.

In the second place, to make our approach a little neerer (if we can) and to descend more particularly into the *Differing Nature* of it; We must confesse it lies mainly in the seeming *equality* of *Use*. So that it may be thus described: A thing *Lawfull* and *Good*, which (as we thinke) *may be Used* or *not*: *may* or *may not* be done.

But here we must take heed we lose not our selves in *Termes*: For if they meane that some things at one time may be done, and at another may not; I yeeld this True: For perhaps this yeare I may not marry, and yet next yeare I may, and in some circumstances must, else I sinne. But in this Hypothesis Marriage is not generally *Indifferent*, because not generally *Lawfull*; but at some time lawfull, at some time not.

If they meane the same Thing, (the same Act) at one and the same time by the same person, *may*, or *may not* be done *ad placitum*, at pleasure, without offence; I must crave leave to dissent, till I see more, than now I see.

For I conceive two direct contraries, (as to marry, and not marry) at the same time, to the same person, cannot be so equally

qually circumstantiated, that one of them, at least in one circumstance (which is enough) shall not be better than the other. And if one be *Best*, I conceive it past scruple, that I may not reject that *Best*, and chuse the *Worst*.

Now, if I mistake not, I am neere the *Apex* of this question, which yet (*Pernassus*-like) hath a double *Vertex*, a twofold toppe.

The one is, whether in two contraries (as *Doing, not doing*) one must not needs be *Better* than the other.

The second is, whether in this case I am not tyed to take, and doe the *Best*, but am equally *Indifferent* to *Both*.

I will begin with this last first. In this I know I have many oppolites, who stiffely mainetaine, that *Optimum non est semper faciendum*, the best thing is not alwaies to be done: amongst these is that good man lately deceased, (to the Churches great losse) Reverend Master *Ball*, in his *Friendly Tryall* of *Separation*.

I thinke it is a subtle dispute, worth the discussing; for if they meane thus, That which is *Best*, is not at all times *Lawfull* to be done while it is best; This sense cannot bee true: for here the *Predicate* is destructive to the *subject*; For, that which is *unlawfull* is not *good*, much lesse *Best*, at the time when *unlawfull*.

Or, if they meane, that the *Best* (*in Re*, in Truth) *is* not alwaies *Possible* to be done; they say True, but tell me no new thing. For all men will yeeld This; and in *This* case I must consider, what is best possible to *me*; because I cannot doe the Best *in Re*.

I suppose then they meane that which is *Best* and possible to me, is not still *necessary* to be done, even while it is best; but though I *may doe* it, yet I may also leave it *undone*, and doe that which is *lesse* good.

Here also they may deceive us with *Termes*. For they may meane either *Best* in *Truth*, or *Best* to *appearance*. And when these two cannot be reconciled by all my search, I must consider that which *seemes* (though perhaps *is not*) the *Best*.

We shall now soone joyne issue. And the case is; whether, when I must of necessity either *doe*, or not *doe*, or when I must doe either *This* or *That*; I be not bound to doe what *is Best*,

(or at leaſt on exacteſt ſearch, *ſeemes* Beſt) if it be *poſſible* to be Done by me.

If they take the *Negative* part (of this queſtion ſo ſtated) I hope yet they will give me leave to hold the *affirmative*, and yet without offence, till my judgement may be better inform'd.

My grounds briefely are theſe, Firſt, it is *Lawfull* to doe This *Beſt*; elſe it is not Good, much leſſe Beſt, as was ſaid before. Againe, it is *Expedient* to doe this *Beſt*: or elſe ſome thing (at leaſt ſome one Circumſtance of *Expedience*) is in the other good, which is not in this, and ſo *This* is not *Beſt*, but *That*, at this time; though at another time, perhaps, *This* may be *Beſt*, it is not *Beſt* now, becauſe not beſt expedient and moſt convenient.

So that at this time, *This* cannot bee *Better* than *That*, except *This* be not onely in it ſelfe *expedient*, but alſo *more* expedient than *That* is at this preſent: for one graine of more *expedience* makes that to be *Beſt*, which elſe would be *Worſt*; And one circumſtance may ſo alter the caſe, that now *That* may be *worſt*, *which elſe* would have beene *Beſt*, as was ſaid before.

I demand now, how I can be determined to That which is *leſſe expedient*? though ſuppoſed *equally lawfull*, by *Right Reaſon*? All Philoſophers yeeld, (and it needeth no diſpute) that the *Underſtanding* rectified ſtill dictates to the *Will*, *Optimum faciendum*, the *beſt* thing is to be done. And how is it poſſible I ſhould doe well, if I follow not the Dictate of *Right Reaſon*? *Video meliora, proboque; deteriora ſequor.*

See now to what a ſtrait I am brought: If I follow the Dictate of *Right Reaſon*, I muſt ſtill doe what is Dictated, as now *Beſt*. And Right Reaſon muſt ſtill (where ſome Action is neceſſary) dictate *That* to be done, which *is* (at leaſt, *ſeemes*) Beſt.

For, if Right Reaſon ſhould ever (though but once) dictate, that This which is Beſt, is not now to be done, but ſomewhat *Worſe*; It may much be ſuſpected Right Reaſon may *never* dictate the *Beſt* to be done.

For, by this Caſe (of one ſuch Dictate) it would appeare, that when ever *Reaſon* doth happen to dictate Right, it is but

but by *chance*, or some *fancy* of its owne; not by any certaine constant Rule, taken from the *Nature* of *Things*, rightly stated in such and such circumstances; For if so, it must still judge *eodem modo*, after the same manner, of That which is so circumstantiated. And, if it once vary from this Rule, it will seeme to have no Rule, but its owne fancy. And in this Case, we shall be under *Reason*, as under a most *corrupt Judge*, that will follow no constant Rule (founded on the Nature of Things) but onely his owne humor; which will give very Different judgements on the very same, or like Cases, in all circumstances.

I see but two Things can helpe them out of This straite. Either, that (though Right Reason cannot but dictate that the Best in all circumstances, must still bee done; yet) wee are not bound to follow *Right Reasons Dictates*, when we see them: Or else, we be not bound to *aske* Right Reason, what it will dictate; but may doe (hand over head, as they speake) without any Dictate of Reason, Right or Wrong.

But, Both These seeme to mee very strange Doctrine. For,

First, If I may but once goe against the Dictate of *Right Reason*, and yet not sinne, I may goe ten thousand times, yea *Ever* against it; and so all my acts may be *Irrationall*, and yet not sinfull: a strange Tenet: and sure a Case never to be found but in a distracted man; who sinnes not, though all his Acts be against Reason, because His Reason is not able to direct him; or at least He not able to follow Reason; and in this case God requires it not.

And the Case is even the same; when I Act without asking Reasons Dictate, as if I acted against Reasons Dictate. For till I see I act *with*, for ought I know, I act *against* Right Reason; and so I sinne.

Not yet, that I thinke a man bound before Every (though the most common) Action, to stay disputing for some houres or dayes, till Reason hath given its finall Dictate. For, this were to turne all practise into bare and nice Speculation. There are many Things by common use, and by themselves, so cleare that at first view Reason presently determines. Yet if there rise but the least scruple at the first glimps; Then, man is bound

to

to discusse it, till Reason rectifi'd dictate the Action Lawfull, and Best to be done: And till This Dictate, the Act must be suspended. For I still thought that a dangerous Maxime in State policy; first, to *Doe* matters, (not like to sound well) and then to *dispute* Them: and it sounds worse in Matters of Religion.

I have done with the first Great Question, whether *Optimum sit semper faciendum.*

I come to the Next, whether amongst divers Things (to be done) There be still One *Optimum*, one *Best*: I must meane whether there be any *Optimum*, for more than *One* there cannot be at one time.

We may briefly State the Question Thus. Whether at any one time Two, or more Things, (suppose to Marry, and not to Marry) can possibly be so *Equally Good* to me, that *One* of them is not Better than the *Other*.

I thinke not. For, I dispute thus: I must bee determined to one of these Two, (having no *medium*) I must Marry, or not Marry. Now I aske what shall determine mee to either? Right Reason (they must answer) or my owne Fancy, Will, or other Thing.

I rejoyne; if Right Reason determine me; either it doth so on no good ground; (and then I doe a groundlesse unreasonable Act, in following Reason) or on some Ground, whose foundation is in *Re*, in the *Thing* it selfe. For, if wee once grant *Reason* any Rule, or Ground, but that Certaine, Constant Truth, which is fixt in the *Nature* of *Things*; wee shall make it, of all Judges, most uncertaine, most corrupt. If once I see my *Reason* judge point blancke against *Reall Truth*, I shall suspect it still.

Well then, it must bee granted, Right Reason hath determined mee (not to Marry) on some good Ground, taken from the Nature of Marriage; (not in Generall, for this would deceive me, but particularly considered with all circumstances *pro hic & nunc*, in this particular, and at this time) so that it must also bee granted, There was one or more circumstances, which made Marriage more unfit than *non* Marriage (else Reason hath *made*, not found a Ground *in Re*, which it must never doe;) *Ergo*, of Marriage, and Non-Marriage,

ſiage, One ſtill is *Beſt in Re*, (at leaſt to Reaſons eye) elſe Reaſon doth unreaſonably determine mee not to Marry, or to Marry.

And if Right Reaſon have not, or cannot determine me; to which ſide ſoever I incline, and reſt, I ſin; becauſe I act *Unreaſonably*: being determined by humour, fancy, paſſion, a wilfull Will, and not Right Reaſon; The Candle of God, which He hath lighted in man, leſt man groaping in the darke ſhould ſtumble, and fall.

I may now ſteppe a little higher; and affirme, that of Two Contraries, or any Two Extreames, *Both* are ſo farre from being *Equally* Good, that *pro hoc ſtatu*, in theſe Circumſtances, Both cannot be good at all, or lawfull.

For, if of theſe Two, One muſt be *Beſt*, and but One; and this One now neceſſary to be done (becauſe Beſt) as was proved before; It will follow that the other extreame is now, in theſe circumſtances, not Good at all to me; becauſe unlawfull to be done, while now there is a better in view; though elſe in it ſelfe, with other circumſtances, it would have beene Lawfull, Good, and Beſt.

If Right Reaſon determine it be better not to Marry, at this time, and I be ſtill bound to do what Right Reaſon ſhall dictate Beſt (as was prov'd before:) Now, in theſe Circumſtances, Marriage is unlawfull to me, and ſo *not Good at all*, at this time, becauſe leſſe Good thãn Non-Marriage. So *Achitophels* Counſell was Bad, being not good for that time, becauſe not Beſt.

For as Moraliſts ſay, if it be poſſible Man could be neceſſitated to chuſe *One* of *Two* Evills; in that caſe the *Leſſe evill* would be Good: So, when I am neceſſitated to chuſe *one* out of *two* (ſuppoſed) *Goods*, the *leſſe Good* would be *Evill*, and unlawfull to me, who am ſtill bound (for ought I can yet ſee) to doe *Optimum pro hoc ſtatu*, the beſt for this Condition.

The *Concluſion* I aym at, through all theſe *Premiſſes*, is this. There is no One thing, no One Act, in all the World, That I *may doe*, or *not doe*, *ad placitum*, at my pleaſure, all Circumſtances conſidered.

For, this Act (ſo propounded) either is Beſt for that time, and ſo muſt needes be done: or not Beſt, and ſo muſt not be

done; becauſe in theſe Circumſtances, at this Time, *it is Unlawfull*; as not being *Good* while a *Better* is in eye: as hath I hope fully beene proved.

From This, reſults our finall Determination concerning *Indifference* (which is our Subject in hand:) No Thing, No Act, is *Indifferent* in *Se*, in *Re*, in it ſelfe, in the thing; but either *neceſſary* to be done, (if *Beſt*) or *unlawfull* to be done, if *Bad*, or *leſſe Good*, *pro hoc ſtatu*.

What ſhall we ſay then? hath the World talked ſo much of *Indifference*, and the *power in Indifference*, And yet no *Indifference*, at all, be in the World?

Give me leave here freely to propound my owne thoughts, without offence; being ſtill more deſirous to learne, than to Dictate.

I conceive that all the *Indifference* (in the world) lies in our Underſtandings, and the Darkeneſſe thereof, (which makes them wavering ſometimes, and doubtfull whether to doe or not, ſo that in them ſeemes ſome *Indifference* to either extreme) but there is none in the things themſelves, or Actions; which are ſtill either *unlawfull*, or *neceſſary* (if Lawfull, at this time in theſe Circumſtances;) never *Indifferent* in Themſelves.

As then it is in the point of *Contingence*, every thing is either True or Falſe, Certainely *to Be*, or *not to Be*, and in one of theſe ſtill *Neceſſary* in *Re*, and never *Contingent*; yet to *Me*, (who cannot ſee the whole *Chaine* of *Cauſes*) ſome things *ſeeme Contingent*, that *are neceſſary*. So for *Indifference*. All Things, All Acts, are *in Re*, either *Neceſſary* to be done, or *Unlawfull*; but to my blind judgment, (while I cannot diſcerne whether I may Act, or may not) ſome things *Seeme*, but *are not Indifferent*; and ſo we thinke (but erroneouſly) that theſe may be done, or not, as we pleaſe.

For example-ſake, ſuppoſe an unskilfull Phyſitian have two *Simples* by him, one of which is poyſon, and the other a pretious Cordiall; will any man living ſay, Theſe are *Indifferent* for a ſicke mans cure; ſo as he may uſe them, or not, *ad placitum*, without perill? And yet now ſuppoſe the Phyſitian ignorant of both their Natures: they may be ſaid to be *Indifferent* (though not in themſelves) yet to Him; who not knowing

ing either, is *Indifferent* to Both, and thinkes hee may apply which he will, without offence; yet if he apply the one he erres, because 'tis *poyson.*

So it is in all the Things, or Acts we thinke *Indifferent.* In themselves they are poysons, or cordialls, very Good, (and so *necessary*) or very Bad, and so unlawfull. But while our judgements are clouded, so that we see not the Nature of these Objects, or Acts: we are *Indifferent* (because wavering) between *Them*; but *They* are not so *in se*; or Really to us.

I may conclude then, Nothing is Indifferent *in Re*, *in Se*; but to our *Understanding* some things seeme so, for want of Good light.

CHAP. VI.

Where the Power *of* Indifferent *Things seeme to be fixed: whether in the* Church, *or not: or if in the Church, How farre. Of the Churches Deciding Commanding Power. Of* Doubts, *and how we must deport our selves under* Doubts.

I Have now done with the Nature of *Indifference*, in which I have beene the more large, because I found it more abstruse than it seemed at first view, I come now shortly to examine *What power may determine in* Indifference, and *where this Power is fixed.*

To All, I may answer briefly thus. *By Divine Right, This Power is, and is not, in the Church.* The Church hath, and hath not, power in *Indifferent* things.

First, the *Church* hath *no power* to make any one thing *Indifferent* in it selfe: (that is, to make it, at one, and the same time, lawfull to be done, or left undone, *positis omnibus circumstantiis*, all circumstances being laid together.) For all Things and Acts, are in themselves necessarily Good or Bad, and cannot be Indifferent *in Re*, as hath beene proved at large.

Againe, wee cannot say the Church hath power to determine what is *indifferent.* If at least All *Indifference* comes only from the *Darknesse* of our *Understanding* (as before;) It then lies not in the power of all other men living, to determine

what *seemes indifferent* to one mans Understanding, since Hee may perhaps not see, what they all see; *& e contrario.*

We are now reduced into a narrow compasse, having onely left to be considered, those Things which *generally seeme indifferent* (For there is no *indifference in Re*, but onely in *appearance* unto us;) because neither Scripture without, or light within, hath fully cleared, whether such things should bee done, or not: or if done, whether in such, or such a time, place, &c. And in such Cases onely Things *seeme indifferent.*

Now in these *seeming indifferents* (which sure are not so many as some pretend) the *Church* hath, and yet hath not, power to determine.

All (though but Seeming) *indifference*, is as it were *in medio*, betweene two *Extremes*, as was said before. Now, when *Neither* of these extremes is *necessary*, There, (specially where *Both* extremes are doubtfull) I conceive the Church hath not power to determine to *Either* Extreme.

As suppose *Blacke* and *White* colours should bee *Doubtfull*, whether both, or either, or neither, were *Lawfull*: In this case (for ought I yet see) the *Church* hath no power to determine (any one so doubting) to either *Blacke* or *White*. The Reason is, because Neither of these extremes are *necessary*, there being so many *intermediate* colours betweene Both.

But when One of the extremes (betweene which we waver as *indifferent*) is *necessary* to be imbraced, (as in most cases it is,) Here all the Power Lawfull, I conceive, can doe no more but resolve which of the Two extremes is *Best*; whether it be safest to Doe, or not to Doe (whereof one is necessary;) to do so, or so, if I must doe.

This Power (where ever it bee) must bee very warily exercised: since of *All Two* extremes, *onely One* (as was proved) can be *Lawfull*: so that one is wholsome, but the other poyson.

In these also the Church *hath*, and *hath not* power. If you please, Thus; It hath a power *Judicative*, (or if you will *Juridicall*) but not *Legislative*. It may, and must determine; (for ought I know, beyond all externall appeale) yet againe it must not determine, *What*, and *How* it *Will*, *because it will.* No,

It

It also hath its bounds, a Rule to goe by, a constant Law (and that *non factam, sed natam*, not which the Church *makes*, but which it *finds*,) *Right Reason.*

So that the Church is like the *Judges* on the Bench in *Westminster Hall* (that have a *Judicative*, or *Declarative* power, being entrusted with the explication, application, and execution of the Laws:) but not as the *King* and *Parliament*, who have a *Legislative* power: and so not onely to declare what is Law, but to make new Lawes. And yet even This High Court hath one Rule, or Law to goe by, (and this is also the Law of the Church, even *Right Reason.*) And if they or the Church, should erre from this Rule, (which God forbid) we must obey indeed, but *Patiendo*, I will, I must give *Passive* obedience to Lawfull Authority; even there where I dare not, I cannot, I may not, give obedience *Active.*

By the *Church* here I meane, not onely One, or Two, or a Few, of what Ranke soever; but All, even every true Member of the whole Church. For I conceive every such Member hath *de jure* a Vote in *This* Determination.

But what if after the Determination, I yet dissent from the judgement of the greater part of the Church, which in all doubtfull causes, seemes justly to challenge (even by the law of Nature) a decisive power; What shall I doe in this Case? shall I make a Rent, Schisme, Faction that may fire Church or State?

God forbid; no, I must *Read*, pray, discourse, and conferre, with all humility submitting my selfe to the Reason of any man that will teach me; much more to the Judgements of many together, eminent for learning and piety. And yet if after all this, I cannot be satisfyed in my Doubts (which must be Reall, and not pretended scruples of a factious spirit) In this case, which sure will be very Rare (where Right Reason is made supreme Judge) I must suspend till my judgement be cleared, lest that which to another is Lawfull, become sin to me: Who cannot Act in Faith, while I act against or with Doubts, or Scruples.

However in the meane time, I must quietly deport my selfe without faction, tumbulent commotion, or uncharitable censure of those who dissent from mee, both in Judgement and

Practice; well knowing that the ſame thing may be Lawfull and neceſſary to one that ſees it ſo; which yet to me is unlawfull, while I ſo doubt.

In this Caſe, I conceive no Power on Earth ought to force my *Practice* more than my *Judgment*. For I conceive the Churches utmoſt compulſive power (which muſt alſo very warily, and but rarely be uſed) is but Expulſion, or *Excommunication*; which yet I ſuppoſe may ſcarce ever be exerciſed on one that *ſo doubteth*: much leſſe *Fine*, *Impriſonment*, *loſſe of member*, *or life*: Except his diſſent in practice hath neceſſarily with it a deſtructive influence into the State alſo, and Body Politique. Which caſe I thinke hardly ever poſſible, in *thoſe Things* which can be objects of Rationall Doubts: which are onely ſuch as the Scripture hath not determined. And in all things not determined by Scripture, (which ſure muſt needes be of leſſe conſequence) One that Doubts with reaſon and humility, (may not for ought I yet ſee) be forced by Violence.

Give me leave by ſome Inſtances to cleare my meaning, in all the premiſes concerning the power in Indifferent Things.

Time, Place, and Deportment of our ſelves in the Congregation, are the maine, if not ſole things, which beare this acceptation of *Indifferent*: The Scripture not having laid downe expreſſe Rules for all particular caſes of *This* Nature. So that we ſeeme left *Indifferent* to the uſe of This or That Place, this or that Time, this or that Geſture, &c.

In theſe Things (not determined by Scripture) there muſt be ſome determination, becauſe one of the extremes is neceſſary, (We muſt uſe ſome Place, ſome Time, ſome Geſture) elſe all limitation here were needleſſe, if not unlawfull, as was ſaid before.

The Church then Doubtleſſe hath power to reſolve here, What Time, what Place, what Deportment, &c. and what they doe herein (though it ſhould prove to be Evill) They doe by power which God hath entruſted them with.

And yet againe, the Church here muſt not command what ſhe will, becauſe ſhe Will; but muſt goe by her Rule, which is *Right Reaſon*: if ſhe ſwarve from this, ſhe erres. And Hee that ſeeth Her error, or Doubteth, ſinnes alſo, if (while he ſo doubteth) he yeeld her more than *Paſſive Obedience*: and

if

if she force one so Doubting, I thinke she sinneth more.

Now I need not rippe up the foulenesse of our Bishops miscarriage in their practice about Indifferent Things, which yet hath fully suited with their principles, as was touched before.

For though I should grant (which I never shall) that onely they, and their Creatures, were the whole Church: Yet would they be so farre from a power of making things *Indifferent*, (which yet some seeme to challenge, or at least to exercise) that indeed they have no power to determine what is *Indifferent*: since it may be very easie for some men to thinke that *indifferent*, which to others seemes clearely either *unlawfull* or *necessary*.

Againe, in things seeming (generally) *Indifferent*, they have no power peremptorily to determine to one Extreme, when there is a *medium* betweene both extremes, and so neither is *Necessary*.

In things seeming Indifferent, where one extreme is necessary, They cannot determine *pro arbitrio*, as they please, (but by a constant Rule of Reason) much lesse by a Tyrannicall club Law force us to doe (though we rationally, and modestly doubt whether it be lawfull) what they first *Make*, rather than *find* Indifferent, and then (by their wonted maximes in *indifferent* Things) make *Necessary*, on paine of Imprisonment, losse of *Eares*, yea life it selfe.

Which yet might be more tolerable, if they onely tooke a Dictator-like power, to direct our judgements, in things that seeme most abstruse, or doubtfull (in which yet they make themselves Gods; for none but God can fully cleare, much lesse force my judgement;) But they scruple not, point blanke to contradict our Reason, and force our consciences, in things extremely manifest; as in Bowings, and many other things, which one as blind as he that so much commended *Rhombus*, may see to be *unlawfull*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Consequents *to a Bishops Office. His Relations Upward and Dependances. Of his* Vote *in* Parliament. *Relations Downward: How repugnant to* State-Policie.

WE have seene the *Antecedents*, *Concomitants*, or *Ingredients*, to our Bishops Office. Let us a little view some of the *Consequents*, that result from his Office.

We shall consider but Two, or rather One with Two Heads, (like himselfe) at least looking two wayes; His *Relations* both *upward* and *downward*.

First, *Upward*. *Nescio quo fato*, I know not by what destiny, Our Bishops have still depended on anothers Becke. In the time of Popery, they were wholly moulded to the Popes Will; which oft produced such wilfull and stubborne deportment (both towards their Soveraigne and equals) that wise men of those times beganne to perceive how insufferable such forraine dependance would still bee in any free State.

Winchester was not the first, though One, that in *Edward the first his Time*, professed such universall Obedience to his Creator the Pope, that he quickely learned to refuse (that I may not say, disdaine) to call the King his *Lord*. And his Treasons against the Kings Person, made all men see how easie it was, and still would be, to reduce such Principles into Practice.

Edward the third summoned a Parliament to enable himselfe for the warres he designed: But the *Arch bishop Stratford* (fearing it might injure the Popes Title, if he might not be permitted there *to erect his Crosse*) refused to come, detained his Bishops, and prided himselfe in hindering his Soveraignes designe.

Norwich handled the *second Richard* with the same pride and Insolence; Levying Souldiers at the charge of the Kings Subjects to fight the Popes *Battles*.

We have not forgot *Becket*, and divers other of his temper, but reserve them to another place.

Under

Under the Reformation; if they have indeed cast off the *Pope*, (which may be doubted in most, but is past doubt in some) yet they have ever beene at their command, by whose favour they stand, though (with that unhappy bird) they designe the Death of *Those* that give them Life.

This dependance appeares in a threefold Gradation.

1. The *Calling* (of the Bishops now in dispute) being only *Jure Humano*, they must therefore comply, not onely to fix their *Persons*, but their *Callings*.

2. When they are invested in their Sees the smile or frown of the Court, addeth or detracteth much from their splendor, comfort, and emolument.

3. Their further advancement, either to a better Bishopricke, or Archbishoprieke, wholly depends on the Princes Will.

Naturalists observe, there is not so much appearance of change in many degrees of Entitie, acquired by a *second* motion; as in one degree, at the first step from *Non Ens*, to *Entitie*. But Moralists find that one little step of new preferment makes more impression upon low spirits, than their first Creation out of Nothing. Both are well reconciled in our Bishops Rising. For what can so sudden unexpected advancement (from Nothing to such an Height of Being) seeme but a new Creation? so that hence such a dependance must needs result, as is that Relation which Nature fixeth in the Creature to his Creator.

Courtesies and *Hopes* are the most oyly *Bribes*, and Bribes blind the eyes of the most wise. With what nature soever *Obligations* meet, they have an irresistible force. If they descend so low as men of base spirits, They there get a species of *Profitable*; and so become like Lime-twigs to Little Birds. It was doubtlesse most feelingly spoken by the *Slave* in *Plautus*, *Esculenta Vincula sunt firmissima*, to which the English Proverb answers, *They that are tyed by the teeth, are tyed most strongly.*

If they meete with men of high rais'd, Generous, Noble thoughts; they yet worke much more, (though out of a more ingenuous Principle) while a true Noble spirit cannot breath under the least shadow of Ingratitude: having first learned that old Proverb, *Ingratum si dixeris.*—Ingratitude is the highest imputation.

How hardly then a Biſhops Conſcience, Judgement, Reaſon, or Will, can be *his owne*; under not onely ſo many *Obligations*, (for the greateſt engagement paſt) but Hopes alſo for new favours to come, (either in higher advancement, or at leaſt in continuance of His ſmiles, whoſe firſt frownes may quickly reduce Them to their firſt principles of Nothing) I leave it to wiſe men to judge.

To whom alſo I humbly propound, (as worthy mature Conſideration) how fit theſe Spirituall Lords may bee to ſit as Law-makers in That Higheſt Court, by whoſe fundamentall Orders (as alſo by the Law of nature) None ought to have Vote, but *Free men*.

And how can they poſſibly be deemed Free, that wholly depend on anothers Thought, (for I neede not ſay, Beck, Smile, or Frowne) not onely for their firſt Creation, but continuall Preſervation in This State, and power of giving Vote in that Court?

But They ſay, This may be alſo objected againſt other Lords, Created by his Majeſties favour; Eſpecially Officers of Court, which yet are not Excluded from Votes in Parliament.

I anſwer firſt, *Incommodum non ſolvit argumentum*, the alleadging of an inconvenience, is not the anſwering of an argument.

Againe, If the Caſe were alike in all Theſe (which I yeeld not) Becauſe we are under One (perhaps invincible) Difficulty, muſt we needs runne and plunge our ſelves into another? Or being once in, may we not get out if we can?

But thirdly, there is a Vaſt Difference betweene Thoſe who cannot but ſtill be affected with Noble, generous, and moſt vertuous deportment; (being ſtill to live in their Names, Honours, poſterity) and Thoſe, who in Their height, are but as *Meteors*, that muſt quickly blaze out, vaniſh, fall, and be no more. Betweene Thoſe whoſe Birth and Breeding hath filled their veines with Heroick noble blood; and Thoſe that are ſo much diſadvantaged both by their *Birth* and *Breeding*: though Their *Birth* is nothing ſo ignoble as their *Education*; Compared with that Breeding a true *States-man* ſhould have.

For,

For, will any wise man living thinke them fit to give Counsell in Princes Closets; to make Lawes in Parliament; and sit Judges in the Highest Tribunals of Civill Justice; that all their life time, (before the *Conge d' eslire* diverted their thoughts) were wholly taken up in turning (rather than reading) *Aquinas* and *Scotus*, with some other schoole Triflers, before they came to some Church Benefice; where ever since they have spent all their time (that might be spared from Tything) in Liturgies, or Canons; Except some new scruple with some of their Neighbours, have cald them to peruse some Author *de Decimis*?

If you view their Civill Converse, they have practised little, but to wrangle downe a Sophister, or to delude a Proctor, in the *Vniversity*; to say Grace to a Gentle-man, or acquaint themselves with a *Reading-Pue*, in the *Countrey*. In Cases of Conscience, they have studied little, but how, with most *compendium*, to digest the Oath of Direct and Indirect, in point of *Simony*; and to swallow the Vow of thrice *Nolo Episcopari*, I will not be made a Bishop, when God and their owne Consciences well know, many of them are not so solicitous for Heaven, as for a Bishoprick. And are These men fit, not onely to rule the whole Church; to Ordaine, Censure, Suspend, Deprive, Excommunicate, *ad placitum*; to governe our Consciences, by Articles, Canons, Oathes, (and what else a Lawlesse *Convocation* may invent;) but also to direct and advise (I might say more) in the Privie Juncto's; to sit at the Helme, to dictate Lawes; *& tantum non*, even almost, to sway the Scepter; which if they forbeare to touch, it is but as *Mercury* once spared *Jupiters* thunder-bolts, which he durst not steale, lest they should roare too loud, or at least burne his fingers.

In the last place my Answer shall be thus. Though the Birth, Blood, Thoughts, Breeding, and all, of a Bishop were as noble as any One, or all the *Peeres*; (which none dare say) Yet are not, cannot, Bishops be possibly so *free*, (and so, not so fit, to sit and Vote in Parliament) as other Lords, and members of that Great Body.

For first, They that have large Estates by Inheritance, and to continue their Names and Families to the same Inheritance, are in all reason probable with more impartiall free-

dome to provide for the Good of the Common-wealth in generall; than thoſe that having little or no Eſtate of their owne (at leaſt, to leave to poſterity) are not like much to looke after the Weale-publike, or Good of poſterity; but rather will ſeeke to humour the preſent times, (being truly *Filii unius Horæ*, Men of a ſhort continuance) eſpecially to inſinuate themſelves into more and more favour with their Creator, and Preſerver, on whoſe ſmile wholly depends more than their *Bene Eſſe*, their welfare.

My Judgement in This is much confirmed by the obſervation of a truly Noble Gentleman, and moſt-highly-well-deſerving States-man, (R. Ea. of E.) who ſaid, *he had now ſerved thirty yeeres in Parliament, and in all that time never knew but Two or Three Biſhops ſtand for the Common-wealth.*

Againe, though all the Branches of *Nobility* firſt ſprouted out from the Roote of *Royalty*; (Honours being in all Good States, Appendices to Majeſty, and wholly diſpoſed by the Royall hand) Yet Eſtates and Revennes did not; which are the Partiments and Supporters of Noble Honours. And Theſe alſo in Biſhops, depend on the Princes Will.

Yea, our Honours and Baronies, though firſt they were granted by the King; yet now being ſo inveſted in Our blood, and become Hereditary, They cannot be revoked. In This therefore we are *Freer* than any Biſhop, whoſe Baronies are onely annexed to their Office, and not inveſted in them by Blood.

We have ſeene our Biſhops Relation upward; Let us now view it looking downe to his own Family, Creatures, and Dependencies. We ſhall ſee all theſe *Conſequents*, as unſutable to *State policie*, as were the *Ingredients*, and *Antecedents* to his Office.

A Biſhops Title and Place is High and Splendid, but his Eſtate (for the moſt part) Meane and Low: at leaſt That which may be left as Inheritance to poſterity.

Now to what unworthineſſe will not Ambition and Avarice carry them? When they looke on themſelves as *Peeres* and *Grandees* of the Kingdome, and againe reflect on their Wives and Children, as thoſe which (after Their Deceaſe) muſt ſoone be reduced from ſuch an height (like falling Starres)

Starres) into their first principles; Must not This be a Great Temptation, by any meanes, right or wrong, to seeke the private inrichment of themselves, and Families, even much before the publike Good of the Common-wealth; which is never more injur'd, then when it is made to stoope and vaile to the boundlesse Ambition of some private, low, base, sordid spirit.

Or suppose, by penurious Living they may in many yeares gleane up a meane Estate to leave to their House, to preserve their name: how miserable and sordid must be their deportment? how base their House-keeping? how Little their Hospitality? Which yet not onely by Scripture, but Reason seemes much (if not most) to be required of the Clergy. Such a Bishop must be as much given to Hospitality, as Blameless in other particulars. But alas, how can Ours be so? Except They can be content to live without any Retinue of Attendance; or be Curst by Posterity, brought up perhaps as Lords, but left as Beggers.

Except then it might be with our Bishops, or Bishops Children, as once it was with that *Roman Dictator*, who being brought from the Plough, was content againe to returne to the Plough, (after he had with all humility, fidelity, and successe, served the Common-wealth in the Highest Office That State at that time did afford) I cannot see why They should so ambitiously desire a Lordly Prelacie; which they can neither leave to posterity; nor carry downe to the Grave; nor yet are sure to keepe all the time they live: for of all Riches, those of a Bishop, may soonest fly away.

If therefore Our Prelates would seriously reflect on their owne Peace, Credit, and Esteeme; Or the Good of their Family and Posterity; (though they would despise the Church, and trample on the State, with the Weale, peace, and flourishing prosperity thereof) sure they would leave the Common-wealth to States-men; and thinke it honour more than enough to serve the Church, and waite on Gods Altar: I mean That Holy Table, which may be served by Them that attend the Word and Sacraments; though they must not neglect This, and serve any Other *Tables*.

But *Venales Animæ*, Mercenary Spirits, will doe any thing

to Rise. Yet I hope Our Bishops doe not, at least will not doe so any more. If so, Let them know the *Wheele* of *providence* can runne as fast backward as ever it did forward. In its descent, they may perhaps sadly reflect on a serious dying speech of one of themselves; *Had I served my God, as I have served my Prince, I should not have beene so deserted now*. Though I must confesse I doubt they have well served neither *God*, nor the *King*. But this shall be discuss'd more anon.

CHAP. VIII.

What Good *our Bishops can doe to the* State, *is examined, whether they have beene, or can be, friends to* Monarchy, *or* Civill *Government.*

WE have seene how much our Bishop makes *against State Policie*; Let us now see what he doth, or can doe, *For* the *State*; For, Both parts must be heard.

It hath still beene the practise of These men to buzze into Princes Eares, that They strike at *Monarchy*, that are displeased with such *Episcopacie*: Like one of the old Queenes Jesters, that would box and pinch any that stood neere him: and if they return'd the like, he would step before the *Queene*, and cry, *Madame here comes a Traytor to strike at your Majesty.*

I know it is one of their first Canonicall principles, *No Bishop, No King.* On this Axletree the whole body of Popery is wheeled about. A specious shew indeede, and One of their Master-peeces of Policie; to acquaint and perswade Kings, of what use they are to Them;

Sed Timeo Danaos, & Dona ferentes, I am afraid of the Grecians, when they come with their gifts.

It is but a Trojan Horse. *Mors est in Olla*, there is Death in the Pot. While they seeme to please *Kings*, they weaken Crownes.

Powers are *Gods Ordinances*; and set over us for Our Good: And *Kingdomes* certainely have more for them in holy writ than any other Government: Shall Royall Crownes then come and stoope to a *Miter?*

La

La France ne tombe pas en Keneville. With them a Woman must not beare the Crowne, and shall the Scepter, with us, bow to the Crosiers Staffe? Let it not be spoken in *Askelon*, nor published in the streets of *Gath*. Hath Christianity abated the *Glory* or power of the Diadem? Bishops would, but Christ will not.

In short, What is the sense of this Maxime? What can it be other than This, that the *Strength*, nay the *Being* of a *King*, depends wholly upon a Bishop?

Prodigious State-Blasphemie! Kings have beene when Bishops were not, and shall be yet much more Glorious, when such Bishops shall be no more. Which shall still be my desire for all Kings; but especially for *Ours*; whose Good and Gracious Government, I shall pray, may yet endure long, and long amongst us.

It is much rather true, *If any such Bishop, no King*; as I hope to make good in my subsequent discourse. Otherwise, (had these beene onely, *Metaphysicall Notions*, or *Mathematicall speculations*) I should not have beene troubled more with a square Cap on a Bishops Head, than I am with a Circle squared in a Mathematicall braine.

It is true, their Grand Master the *Pope*, seemed very officious in setting up the German-Franck Emperour, (the Image of the old beast) But it was not long before he shew'd his Ends. Turne your Eye but a little about, and you shall see an Emperour stand barefoote at his Gate: Here one kneels to kisse that foote that spurneth off His Crowne: There one holds the stirrup, while that Proud Bishop steps up into the saddle.

And have not our Bishops the same Designes with their Holy Father? Even to free themselves from all Power, and to bring all things under their owne Power?

What meaneth this Maxime of Episcopacie, that a Clergy man cannot fall under the Execution of a Civill Magistrate, Except they first degrade him; which they may refuse to doe as long as they please? Is not This to Exempt themselves from all Civill Jurisdiction?

What is the sense of This, that for breach of Their (Church) Injunctions, they may *Excommunicate* people, Ministers,

niſters, Lords, *Kings* themſelves, whom they pleaſe; But ſhortly This, to reduce all men, (Even Princes as well as others) to plenary Obedience to themſelves? And when Once they have paſſed that ſentence on their Soveraigne, at their owne fancie, I doubt not but ſome of them would be ready to receive the Crowne from their kneeling Prince, (as of old) If any King would againe ſo farre forget himſelfe, and lay his Glory in the duſt to be trampled on by ſuch proud inſulting Prelates. Which God forbid.

Their Inſolent Words and Actions, vented lately againſt the Crowne, are very ſutable to theſe *Principles*.

Some of themſelves, in open Court of Judicature, have dirſt to affirme, *They were beholding to none, but Chriſt, for the place they held.*

Others of Them (and Their Creatures) have ſaid They are under no Law of man.

Some have preached point blanck, that Their ſtanding did not at all depend on the Crowne.

Others have flatly denied the King to be Head and Governour in Eccleſiaſticall Cauſes, over all perſons: though they cannot but know that This Title was given mainely to Exclude any other Earthly Head, as it is Interpreted by Order of Parliament.

All of them Erect Epiſcopall Courts, ſend out Summons, Exerciſe Juriſdiction, Sentence, Fine, Impriſon, doe what they liſt, in their Owne name. Though All the Biſhops put together (and *Vis unita eſt fortior*) dare not to doe ſo; (for, the High Inquiſition had a Commiſſion under the Broad Seale) and yet Every particular Biſhop Exerciſeth Juriſdiction under their owne ſeale, by their owne power, in their owne name; without any Commiſſion, directly againſt Statute, by which they all incurre a *Præmunire*.

Indeed they have learnt to faune upon Princes, and would make them beleeve all This is for their Honour, and Advantage: yet they are but Impoſtors; This is but to ſtroake the Horſe (as the Proverb is) till they are well up in the Saddle: for, at That they aime, and thither would they come; which God forbid.

I could heartily wiſh, the Kings of the Earth would bee pleaſed

pleaſed to read Maſter *Broughtons* Epiſtle in his Refining the *Roman Fox.* Or *Nichol. de Clemengiis*, in his Excellent peece *de Corrupto Eccleſiæ ſtatu.* Or that Noble Learned Lords incomparable *Myſterium Iniquitatis*; preſented to Our Late Learned Soveraigne King *James*: though in ſome late Prints it hath beene refined by an Engliſh-Romiſh *Index Expurgatorius*, yet it will ſtill (with the other) repreſent the ſleights of this kinde of Epiſcopacie, in ſuch lively Colours, that I beleeve no Prince would truſt them againe.

I neede not goe farre to ſeek inſtances that may fully repreſent how much Our Biſhops have in all ages promoted the Weale, Peace, and Honour of This Kingdome and Crowne: For their Treaſons againſt the State and King, want not a Regiſter. I could briefely preſent you with a true Emblem of Epiſcopacie *ab ovo ad malum*; from the beginning to the end; and yet not goe higher than the Conquerour.

Lanfranck would have conquered the *Conquerour*: and by gentle inſinuations have perſwaded him to ſubmit his Scepter to the Triple Miter: but, *Etiamſi ſuaſit, non perſuaſit*, though he did perſwade, yet he did not prevaile.

Art could not prevaile, and therefore *Anſelm* went more rudely to worke; Though *Rufus* forbad him, yet with many thankes and much honour from the Pope, he went to *Rome* for his Pall. After he had oftentimes bearded the King in many matters, he ſucceeded ſo well, that he attempts the ſame againſt the firſt *Henry*: and left not till he had cauſed the Scepter to bow, and the Crowne to totter.

In *Stephens* time, Two Great Prelates diſpute about Precedencie, and at laſt paſſing by the King, they call the Pope to be Moderator.

Eeckets heights are well knowne, and ſcarce parallel'd in any Story: Onely as *Henry the ſecond* (that Great Prince) did ſuffer ſore ſtripes here: ſo did the *Duke* of *Tholouſe* in *France*, for joyning with the *Albigenſes*. That was done by a Pope, This by a Biſhop.

King *John* fell (with his whole Kingdome) under an *Interdict*, for ſome quarrell betwixt himſelfe and Two or Three Prelates: nor could he buy or begge his peace but on his knees, reſigning his Crowne to proud *Pandulph*.

In *Edward* the seconds time *Gaveston* was much abetted by *Coventry*, in this a Traitor to his Countrey.

What prankes *Winchester* plaid with *Edward* the *First*, *Stratford* with *Edward* the *Third*, and with the second *Richard*, *Norwich*, was toucht before.

Henry the fourth was ill handled by *Yorke*, that waged warre with him: at the same time *Arundell* vow'd he would not leave a slip of that *Religion* which then he saw dawning in *England*.

In *Henry the sixts* time, *Yorkes* quarrell with *Winchester*, lost all that *England* had gained from *France*, at last *Yorke* sides with *Warwicke* against the *King*.

Edward the fourth had little cause to pardon the new Arch-Bishop.

Ely ended better then he beganne, but it was *per accidens*; for first he perswaded *Buckingham* to claime the Crowne, but He refusing (at least not daring to stirre for himselfe) sets him on *Richmond*, the true Heire.

But you will say, These were all *Papists*, and lived in the darke times of *Popery*.

True, and were not their Soveraignes such also? were not Kings and Bishops of one Religion then? Are they more now, hath a Protestant Prince now more reason to trust a Protestant Prelate, than a Popish King a Popish Bishop? Let all the world judge. Seeing in Those times it was no difference in Religion, But Malignance against Civill Government, that produced These Commotions, in Those Bishops.

But since the Pope, and Popish Religion is confessed to be the Cause of all those Treasons and Rebellions, what if I prove Prelacie and Popery to be the same *in re*, and onely to differ in name? This we shall Essay anon. In the meane time It is worth considering whether Our Prelates be not more like to side with the Pope against a *Protestant*, than *Popish* Prince?

I will over-looke the darke times of *Popery*; Let us beginne with the *Reformation*, (which yet could hardly have entrance, for that strong Opposition the Prelates still made) Alas what Commotions have they still raised in *Scotland*, and ever since the Reformation? We have *felt*, what Our Parents onely

saw.

saw. They Eate (at least suffered) a *soure grape*, and Our Teeth were almost all set on edge. But blessed be God that hath delivered That Church and State from Tyrannicall Prelates; and will ere long deliver us also.

They did the same in *Denmarke*, till one of their Kings did perswade the people to Choose another Church Government: After he had in publike read a *Charge* for three houres long, containing Their Treasons, and Rebellions even since the Time that the Pope was cast out of that Countrey.

When I call to minde their Cariage and miscariage here in *England*, I must beginne with that of the Poet,

Infandum Regina jubes renovare dolorem; It is the renewing the memory of our great griefes, and miseries.

Our first Reformation was much opposed by Bishops. *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and some others were no Changelings. Yea we shall finde some *Good* men were *Bad* Bishops; and the *Evill* were intolerable. *Ridley* was too fierce in maintenance of *Ceremonies*. *Cranmer* and *Ridley* both were for allowing Masse to the Lady *Mary*: but That Admirable young Prince, was even in his Infancie, with King *David*, wiser than his Teachers: and could weepe, though not yeeld to Their perswasions.

What our Bishops did in Queene *Maries* dayes (Bloody Times!) we all know; sure it was an unhappy Proverb that was then learnt, *The Bishops foot hath trodden here*. What they *intended* under the Old Queene, *Essayed* in King *James* his Reigne; and had well nigh *performed* under Our Gracious King *Charles*, to the Ruine of the Crowne, We now beginne to know: If at least *Knowledge* may properly be said to bee wrought by *Sense*; for, If so, our Feeling was enough to Teach us. Yet what wanted in *This*, may be supplied by the Daily complaints wee are forced to heare not onely from *England*, but *Ireland* also; where yet perhaps they have more parts to act than one. But *he that sitteth in Heaven Laugheth at them*, *the most High hath them in derision*.

CHAP. IX.

How suitable such Episcopacie *can be to* Monarchy, *is farther considered. Whether the Best forme of Church Government be* Monarchicall. *Whether other Formes may not well stand with* Civill Monarchy. *How* Church *and* State *Government differ and agree.*

I Have scarce done with that Grand Principle of Episcopall policie, *No Bishop, No King.* Yet I must now divert you a little from it, or at least lay it aside awhile, till It come in againe at due place: which perhaps may be in This next dispute.

I am now come to the most moderate of Episcopall men. For even These affirme that *The absolute Best Church Government, under a Monarchy,* is *Monarchicall.*

By the Way I must desire it may againe be remembred that hitherto I have contended onely with our *Lordly Civill Episcopacie,* (properly called *Prelacie*) I have not yet disputed Ecclesiasticall Episcopacie in generall, or the Prelacie of One Minister before another (though I may touch That also before I conclude:) so that I am not bound to answer this Objection; which sure cannot meane that the Best Church Government under *Monarchy,* is *Tyrannicall,* (as indeed such Lordly Prelacie is even in their owne Judgements which are moderate) but simply *Monarchicall, scilicet in Ecclesiasticis*: against which I have not yet disputed; though I know This was One of the maine Foundations on which That Destroyer, That man of sinne beganne first to build.

But I am content to follow them Here also. Yet I must first sift out their meaning, lest they deceive me with words. Doe they meane that *All other* Church Governments are destructive to *Monarchy?* or doe they meane, *Monarchy* is destructive to All other Church Governments but *Monarchicall?*

The first sense is even the same with the former Axiome we discuss'd, *No Bishop, No King*; except perhaps they grant, that every *Monarch* is a *King,* but every *King* is not an absolute *Monarch.*

But take *Monarchy* in what sense you please: why cannot it stand with any kinde of Church Government? doth the supreme

ſupreme Civill power receive any *eſſentiall* part of it from *Church Monarchy?* Is not Monarchy compleat even there where is no Church?

I am by no meanes of their judgements who ſay, *None that are without the pale of the Church have right to any Thing here below.* A Tenet almoſt neceſſary to thoſe that uſe to excommunicate Princes *ad placitum*, and then ſtirre up forraine Enemies, or Subjects themſelves, to diſpoſſeſſe ſuch Princes; but to other States of very dangerous conſequence.

I clearly conceive an Heathen Emperour may be as lawfull a *Monarch*, as any Chriſtian Prince; And I doubt not, but His Subjects owe as exact obedience to Him, (if his Civill Title be juſt) as we juſtly pay to our Kings and Governours.

To ſay then that *Monarchy* cannot ſtand without Monarchical Diſcipline in the Church, is to weaken (if not to break) the nerves and ligaments of ſupreme power: nay to ſay that ſuch a government will beſt ſute with *Monarchy*, is to vaile the luſtre and Majeſty of Monarchy, which like an healthfull ſtomach, can eaſily aſſimilate all things to it ſelfe, but is not changed by any.

If they would but ſpeake their owne Thoughts, They would turn the Propoſition thus, *Church-Monarchy cannot ſtand without Civill.* Here the *Myſtery* is unmasked. It is true, *This Diſcipline* cannot ſtand, but where *Princes* will uphold it. For that which hath no footing in *Scripture*, muſt leane upon *Humane Right*; and thus it diſcovereth its owne weakeneſſe. *Divine Inſtitution* is able to bottome it ſelfe upon it ſelfe; but *Humane* is like the weake *Vine* or *Hop*, which without a pole, muſt creepe, and ſo rot, upon the earth. Yea ſome inventions of Men (ſpecially in matters of Religion) are like the weake Fruitleſſe Ivy, that muſt be propt up by ſome *Elme*, or mighty *Oake*, and yet moſt unnaturally deſtroyeth That prop which holdeth it up. And of This kind is that *Humane* (or rather Demonical) *Epiſcopacie*, of which we have treated all this time.

Our Biſhops foreſeeing This, (for They are wiſe in their generation) thought beſt to invert the propoſition; and inſtead of this, that *Church monarchy cannot ſtand without Civil*, They affirme *Civill Monarchy* cannot ſtand without that of the *Church*. Thus they delude Silly people.

But to come a little neerer to their Beſt meaning, (Who ſtand ſo much for *Church Monarchy*) I would gladly be ſhewed by Reaſon, what there is in Church government why it may not derive it ſelfe into ſeverall Corporations; where either more or fewer may beare the ſway; ſtill ſubſcribing to thoſe things which are left by Chriſt to the Civill government, or Monarchicall power. We ſee hundreds of Corporations are thus managed: And what there is *in formali ratione* of Church government (eſſentiall to Church government) that will not endure This; *mihi non liquet*; Truly I doe not yet know, I cannot yet imagine.

We ſee ever ſince the reformation of *Luther* and *Calvin*, the Churches of Chriſt have had another diſcipline than ours; under Elective and Succeſſive, under Proteſtant and Catholique Princes, as will appeare clearely in *Poland*, *Denmarke*, in *Scotland*, and the *Palatinate*, in *France*, and *Germany*. I do from my heart agree that *Civill* Governours are *Cuſtodes utriuſque Tabulæ*, the Preſervers of both the Tables: but what the Civill Magiſtrate hath to doe in Church matters, till the Church hath done her utmoſt, I could yet never learne.

The government of Chriſt is ſpirituall; and Hee will have his worke wrought in a ſweete way; by the power of the Spirit, not by force.

If I erre in This, I ſhall upon better reaſon recant; In the interim, hoping that the clearneſſe of my thoughts ſhall with the candid Reader receive gentle interpretation, I ſhall freely declare my opinion in This point.

Chriſt (as I ſhall more fully prove hereafter) hath cleerly unfolded to us the Two main things of Church affaires:

1 The Doctrine.

2 The Diſcipline of his Church.

Who will come in this caſe to adde or diminiſh any thing?

I appeale to any Ingenuous Reader, of what Religion ſoever he be (yea of what ſect in any Religion) Whether any power ought to force a Church in matter of *Doctrine*.

I conceive, what *is* True Doctrine the Scripture muſt judge, and none but the Scripture: but what a Church will take for True Doctrine, lyes only in That Church.

Will

Will *Rome* admit us to expound to them this place, *Hoc est corpus meum*? shall wee admit *Rome's* expoſition? Will *either* of us admit force?

There is certainly but one Truth: but what ſhall be taken by the Church for Truth, the Church muſt judge.

If you deſcend to Diſcipline, will not the Caſe cleerly be the ſame?

In Diſcipline conſider three things.

1 Admiſſion of members.

2 Excommunication.

3 Officers to execute theſe, and other Ordinances.

Whether you will Baptize children, and ſo by adminiſtring to them the Sacrament of Initiation, admit them members of the Church?

Whether you will admit all for Church members that barely profeſſe, though they be open drunkards, and very ignorant perſons?

Whether you will have *Paſtors*, *Teachers*, and *Elders*, as your ſuperiours in this worke, or *Biſhops*, *Archbiſhops*, *Primates*, &c. who ſhall judge but the Church?

So long as the *Church*, in her *Church* Tenets, intermedleth not with *State* matters under the notion of Religion, I ſuppoſe the *Civill* power is not to interpoſe.

It is moſt true, if the *Church* will broach (with the *Anabaptiſts*) that they will have no *Governours*, nor Government: This is a point not of Divinity, but Policie; and here the Scepter muſt ſet a rule. Or with the *Adamites* (if there be any ſuch) allow Communion of wives: This takes away property, The ſword muſt divide this quarrell. Or with the Papiſts, that it is lawfull to *kill Kings*: that faith is not to be kept with *Heretiques*: I conceive in all theſe, (and caſes of the like nature) the deciſion lyeth in the *Magiſtrate*; for theſe tenets overthrow either Civill Government, or civill converſe; The Church muſt not goe out of her bounds.

But if the Queſtion be, how you will expound ſuch a Scripture: what Geſture you will uſe in ſuch an ordinance: what man is fit to be excommunicated: what deſerveth excommunication: what is Idolatry: what is wil-worſhip: what ſuperſtition: what is the puniſhment of thoſe crimes:

who

who shall judge but the Church?

The Prince hath granted to such a Body by Charter, such priviledges, such offices, who can interpose but the power instituting? Christ hath given us a platforme of Church government, with the offices, and officers; who may here intermeddle, but Christ himselfe?

It is most true when the Church findeth any refractary, and thereupon doth excommunicate him, he fals into the hands of the Civill Magistrate, if he continue pertinacious, and not before.

When Parliaments doe consider matters of Religion, they doe it to deliver the *Church* from some who would impose upon her; who would take the keyes from her, that by the help of these keyes, they may wrest the *Scepter* out of the hand of *Soveraignty*, which God forbid.

And whilst *Parliaments* labour thus for the *Church*, dealing no further in the affaires of the Church, than by *Scripture* they may, certainely they doe well; but if they once exceede their bounds, the issue will be *Confusion* instead of *Reformation*.

Church and *State* government differ as much as the *Sexes*. Yet as there may betweene These be an happy union: (Both keeping their bounds whilst the Husband hath the supremacie;) So may there be betweene the *Church*, and *State* a sweete harmony. The State having Committed to it the custody of the ten Commandements, and yet the Church preserving to her selfe Her rights.

If the Church swallow up the State, as it is in Popery, and Episcopacy, the issue will be slavish, grosse superstition, and stockish Idolatry. If the State overtop the Church, there will be ignorance and atheisme: but give to *God* that which is Gods, and to *Cæsar* that which is *Cæsars*: and both Church and State will fare the better.

Thus under favour, both by reason and president it is cleere, that any *Church policie* besides *Episcopacie*, (though onely one by right ought) may stand with *Monarchy*.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Who it is that opposeth, and exalteth himselfe above all that is called God. *Who is properly a* Papist: *and what is* Popery: *Why the* Pope *is most properly* Antichrist: *How such* Episcopacy *differs or agrees with* Popery.

WHen I say, *Any Church Government may stand with Monarchy*, or other *State-Policy*, I desire to be understood of *any Church Government well regulated*: Which as I cannot conceive of our *Episcopacy*, so I must againe publiquely protest, that I verily beleeve This kind of *Episcopacy* is destructive, not onely to Good Monarchy, but all other State Policie whatsoever.

I meane not now to runne over, so much as the Heads of my former discourse: Every particle of which is to represent how incongruous, and incompatible to true Policie of State, Our Bishops Place, Calling, and Office is, as now it stands establisht in this Kingdome.

If any man shall yet dissent from me in this Cause, I shall now onely intreat him to view one place of Scripture, which yet perhaps at first glance may seeme to make but little for my purpose: but it is an old Maxime among Interpreters, *Non est hærendum in Cortice*, we must not rest in the Letter. Let us therfore a little examine the Text, and if I be not in the Right, I will gladly learne of any that can better informe me.

The Place I meane, is that which of old in the Primitive Church was wont to be more perused, and examined, than I thinke it is now, or hath beene of late: and I cannot much wonder, sith I see all men view the *Sea*, and well consider it at distance from the top of a Cliffe or Rocke; but when they are once falne into it, they shut their eyes, winke, and care to see as little as may be of it, while they have so much round about them.

I must not detaine you too long without, lest you thinke my Porch longer and bigger than my House. It is that of the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*, *Ep. 2. ch. 2. ver. 3, 4.* specially those words: *Who opposeth and exalteth himselfe above all that is called God, or is worshipped.*

For the underſtanding of this place, we muſt premiſe This, that it muſt not be taken as ſpoken of *One ſingle perſon*: but a *Compages* of *many*, either exiſting together, or elſe ſucceeding one another; yet agreeing together in this great Apoſtaſie, the maine thing here ſpoken of. And in this I have but few Adverſaries: None I thinke, but ſome few of the Romiſh faction, that maintaine the grand Deceiver, Falſe Prophet, or Apoſtate (for ſo I rather call him, than Antichriſt, though I doubt not alſo but he is moſt truely Antichriſt *in Re*) ſhall come onely in the end of the world, and indure but three yeares and an halfe: which yet begins to ſound but ill among the Romaniſts themſelves.

In the next place I affirme, this *Man* of *Sinne* (for ſo I muſt ſtile him) is not of the *Laity*, over whom (even over their Princes and Gods) he exalteth himſelfe; but of the *Clergie*, For he ſitteth in the *Temple of God*.

Being come ſo farre (without any Reall oppoſition) I now demand, Who This *Man* (*Compages* or *Syſteme* of *Men*) is, or can be? The *Pope*, I ſuppoſe will be anſwered by moſt of our Church. And I yeeld it ſo; beleeving Him to be principally intended here. But if I can prove that *Popery* properly taken, is the ſame *in Re*, with *Our Epiſcopacy*; or at leaſt that *This* is but a Piece and Part of That *Myſtery* of *Iniquity*, then I hope it will be granted, that ſuch *Epiſcopacy* is alſo here intended: and *per conſequens*, that ſuch *Epoſcopacy* is altogether againſt true Policie of State, becauſe it oppoſeth and exalteth it ſelfe above All that is called God, &c.

This therefore is now my Taske, to prove that *Our Epiſcopacy*, is the ſame Really with *Popery*, taken *Properly*.

Let us firſt then ſee what *Popery properly* may ſignifie: for, for ought I yet ſee, the world is ſcarce agreed in this particular. I cannot conceive that All Errours or Hereſies held by ſome (nay all) *Papiſts*, may in proper ſpeaking be called *Popery*. Moſt (I hope all) of the Papiſts *agree* with us in many Truthes, and all is not *Hereſie* in which they *Differ*: and yet All *hereſie* in them, not proper *Popery*. No not every Error or Hereſie in the *Pope* himſelfe can *proprie loquendo* be ſaid to be *Popery*. There are many

many Things the Papists hold in common with many, if I may not say, All *Heretickes*: yet none ever properly called All *Heretickes* by the compendious Name of *Papists*. Many points are not yet so fully determined among themselves, but that some of them *affirme*, and others *deny* of the same subject. All of them will not agree about Originall sinne, Free will, Merit, &c. In this last (which yet is one of the most fundamentall points of controversie now betweene us) I see many of them comming so neere the Truth, that one must have a quicke sharpe eye to see where they come short: for many of them yeeld Our workes doe not properly *merit* as Ours, but as *Tincta sanguine Christi*, as dyed in the blood of Christ; yea and some are not rigid in pressing the phrase *Merit*, in its proper sense, so that perhaps Their most refined opinion in This, may be more dangerous in the Consequence, than substance or forme of it.

Nay, before the Councell of *Trent*, (before which yet *Popery* had beene long in the world) most of their Tenets were so much indetermined, that scarce any of them knew what he was to hold and beleeve; yet he was a Papist then, and is so still, and yet to this Day I thinke there is scarce one Doctrinall point, in which they all agree.

We must then consider what that is which Denominates a *Papist*, and may properly be called *Popery*. It must sure be somewhat *Essentiall* (as I may speake) to that Church, so that without this, it could not be called a *Popish* Church.

That is doubtlesse such and such *Dependance on the Pope*: This is in the Popes subjects truely *Popery*; and this Dependance on Him, is perhaps expressed by receiving his *Name* or *Character* in the Apocalyps. In the *Pope* himselfe, it is not this or that errour, this or that Heresie, but such an Independance, such a Lordship, such a Prelaticall Tyranny, over civill and Church estates, that is καθ' ἐξοχὴν *Popery*. And this is it that is so emphatically expressed here in This place to the *Thessalonians*, *He opposeth and exalteth himselfe above all that is called God, &c.* And the exercise of this Popish Tyranny is lively limn'd out in *Apoc.* 13. *ver.* 16. & 17. *And he caused all, both small and great, rich and poore, free and bond, to receive a marke in their right hand, or in their foreheads, And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had*

the marke, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

This Tyrannicall Prelaticall Power and Dominion, which the Pope usurpeth and exerciseth (contrary to Gods Word) over Clergy and Laity, Princes and Subjects, in their estates and consciences, is in Him, (as in His Clients, *yeelding* and *submitting to this Popish Prelacy*) *True Proper Popery*. And This is the Giving, Imprinting, or forcing of a Name, Character or Number, on the Popes part, as Receiving This on the part of *Papists*: though I have not now time, at least not opportunity, to discusse how much the Popes *Name*, *Character* and *Number* may differ. I doubt not but all are parts of That Prelaticall, usurped Power which is truly *Popish*; and received by *Papists*, as Servants and Souldiers of old received their Lord's and Commanders *Tessera*, or Character in their hands and foreheads. But God also hath impressed his *Motto* on them all, let them read it and tremble; *Apocal.* 14. 9, 10. *And the third Angel followed them, saying with a loud voyce, If any man worship the Beast and his image, and receive his marke in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drinke of the wine of the wrath of God, which is powred out without mixture into the cup of his indignation, and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy Angels, and in the presence of the Lambe.*

God hath beene pleased to parcell out *Church* and *Commonwealth* as severall and distinct Governments: yet so that Princes should be *Custodes utriusque Tabulæ*, as was said before.

God hath beene pleased to make, appoint, and leave the Ministers of the Gospel *Brethren*, and hath permitted none of them a Lordly Prelacy above another.

But now the Pope comes, with a wide mouth, and swallowes downe at once, all *Civill* and *Ecclesiasticall* power; Challengeth to himselfe, not onely the *Keyes*, but the *Sword*; not onely Papall Dominion in *Ecclesiasticis*, but Regall also in *Civilibus*. This Usurpation of His, is properly *Popery*; and this robbeth *Christ* of his *Regall Office*.

As every sinne breakes all the Commands, (the whole Law) yet some sinnes doe more properly intrench on some particular command: so also is it in all Heresies and errors. All some way oppose the whole Law of Christ, and all the three Offices of *Christ*; yet some more properly One of these Offices,

Offices, some another. As the Doctrine of *Merit, de Condigno, & Congruo*, of Condignity, and Congruity, encroacheth on Christs Priestly Office; the *Alchoran* mainely against his *Prophetical*. But *Popery* most properly strikes at his Kingly Office and Authority. For it is Christs Kingly Office to bind *Kings in Chaines, and Princes in Fetters of Iron*, if they resist him. And He that usurpes this Power and Priviledge, labours to unthrone Christ, to sit above him, and so properly *opposeth and exalteth himselfe above all that is called God, or is worshipped. This is the Pope, and this is Popery.* Yea I may adde, this is truely and most properly *Antichrist*; though indeed perhaps not that *Antichrist* of whom Saint *John* speakes in his first Epistle, Chap 2.22. and 4.3. who, it may be, was *Ebion*, or *Cerinthus*, or some other: though perhaps also Saint *John* might speake that of some Lordly Prelacy, which beganne (though but to dawne, if I may so speake of that darke mystery, beginning to shew it selfe) even in Saint *Johns* daies: for in some respect we will not stand to yeeld a Bishops Pedegree might perhaps extend so high: for even then Antichrist was conceived.

However, I doubt not to affirme the *Pope* is now most Really, Truely, and properly, the Grand *Antichrist*. For such is He most properly, that encroacheth on *Christs Regall Office*. This being it, which now (of all the three) is most proper to him in his *Glory*: and this he hath received as a most glorious Reward (if I may so speake) for all his sufferings in his humane Nature: and this I thinke the Scripture Language, (*Esay* 53. 12. *Psal.* 110.7. *Phil.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11. 1 *Cor.* 15. 27.) His *Priestly* worke was for the most part accomplisht in his *Death*; His *Prophetical* Office, as it were resigned over to his Holy *Spirit*; But his Kingly Office is his owne propriety, (till the end come) and so he that opposeth this, is most truely *Antichrist*. This is the *Pope*, and this is *Popery*.

Now on the other part, if any man please to survey *Episcopacy* with an unpartiall eye, he shall find this kind of *Episcopacy*, and *Popery* to be all one *in Re*, for they have the same *Rise*, the same *Media* of their progresse, and the same *End*.

The rise of Popery, was by overthrowing Christs Ordinances, and setting up of his owne. That this may appeare

the more diſtinctly, give mee leave to ſhew you the Biſhops boldneſſe in the particulars of it.

Chriſts Ordinances in the New Teſtament, are either concerning *Doctrine*, or *Diſcipline*. I confeſſe the *Pope* hath made great aſſaults upon the doctrinall part; but what he hath done in that kind, he hath done many times by gathering up the regorgements of others, and ſo they are not his owne: or as an *Heretique*, but not as *Pope*, for the reaſons which I have even now mentioned.

But he hath plaid his part mainely in point of Diſcipline: This moſt properly belonging to Chriſts royall Office, as Doctrine to his Propheticall.

In the Diſcipline there are two things conſiderable.

1. That which concerneth the Officer.
2. That which concerneth the Nature of his Office.

In the caſe of the Officer, you have his *Acceſſe* to his Office, and his *Execution* of the Office. In the firſt *Election* and *Ordination* are conſiderable.

By Gods rule his *Election* is to be *by the people*; his *Ordination from the people* by the hand of the *Presbytery*. By the rule of *Popery*, a Miniſter is *Ordained* by the *Pope*, and his Subſtitute, and is *elected* by the ſame power, and in the ſame way. And as their Schoole darkens (with a miſt of their termes) what they cannot *cleere*: So doe Theſe; to cloud their ſwarving from Chriſts rule, They raiſe up new termes, and inſtead of *Election*, have *Preſentation*, *Inſtitution*, and *Induction*. The firſt is done by the *Patron*, the ſecond by the *Biſhop*; a way which Chriſt never knew. It is ſo well knowne to all men that *Epiſcopacy* traces theſe very paths of *Popes*, that I ſhall not need to ſay more for this part of their Identity.

In the execution of his Office there are Acts of two ſorts: ſome wherein he hath a *Joynt* power with other; ſome wherein he is a *ſole Agent*: he is ſole in Church preaching, and in adminiſtration of the Sacraments; he is coadjutor to others in Admiſſion of members, in Excommunication.

Under the Papacy, the Miniſter or Prieſt hath the power of Preaching, and Adminiſtration according to Gods Law (and this onely with relation to the Biſhop, who in his Church ſuperintends:) But in the other he hath no power at all; it

is

is wholly given up to the Pope, and by him committed to the Bishop. And thus the Pope may truely (while he is *Dominus Dominorum*) stile himselfe *servum servorum*: for he impropriates all Offices to himselfe; and in liew of coadjutors given by God to the Minister, the Bishop hath Officers appointed him by the Pope.

The Coadjutors of the Ministers by the Word, in some cases were the *People*, in some cases the *Elders* and *Deacons*, and sometimes People, Elders and Deacons: but the Pope in lieu of these hath instituted another generation of helpers; and lest that true name should reduce true Officers, he hath given them yet another title, as *Apparitor*, *Surrogate*, *Chancellour*, *Officiall*, *Commissaries*, *Deanes*, *Church-wardens*, *Overseers* of the poore. In all which *Episcopacy*, and *Popery* have so twin-like a frame, that seeing one, you see both; *Nec Sosia Sosiæ similior, nec simiæ simia*, *Sosia* is not more like to *Sosia*, nor an Ape to an Ape: And so I leave that point, which concernes the *Officer*.

In the Nature of his office it is considerable, first, What the worke of his Office is: secondly, From what power: and thirdly, in what manner he doth it.

For the first, the subject matter of his office is Administration of the Sacraments, Preaching, Admission of members, Excommunication. In reckoning these, the Pope conformeth to Gods Word, and so doth *Episcopacy*; for if we will erre, we must sometimes goe right, and then we may transgresse with lesse suspicion.

But consider from what power the Minister of the Gospell Acts. Hee ought not to borrow his Commission from any but from Christ, from Scripture; and he ought to keepe close to That: now the Papacy is wholly steared by Traditions, Decretals, Councells, Canons, Colledge of Cardinals, and the Pope in the Chaire, where he cannot erre in matters of Faith. The Pandects of the Civill Law, are too too boystrous, and of too great extent for any Civilian to comprehend; and yet that body of their learning is boyled up to such a degree that it runnes over, and no memory is able to attaine it, more than to compasse perfection in the learning of the *Chinoes*, where the A.B.C. amounts to 10000. letters. Constitutions

crosse

crosse one another, and almost all fight against the Gospell of Christ.

Doth not Episcopacy (*Si magna licet componere parvis*, If I may compare great things with small) according to its *modicum*, doe the same? I confesse with them the *Scripture* is the rule: but who must expound this Scripture? Synods, Councels, Convocations, Bishops, Archbishops. Some of these sometimes, sometimes all of them. And though by their owne confession, these bind not mens Consciences, yet they bind them to obedience: which obedience they doe precisely challenge, and when they faile thereof, they doe without the least scruple of conscience, proceed to Excommunication, fine, imprisonment, deprivation, and what not? In the meane time it is held a sin for a Lay man at all to thinke of these studies. The *Priests* lips (they say) must preserve knowledge: It is a sad case (say they) when men with unhallowed hands will touch the *Arke*, and with unsanctified eyes, pry into these mysteries; and so these men, making the Scripture a Rule in appearance, doe in truth Monopolize all to themselves: This is just and flat Popery.

In the last place, the *Manner* which God hath prescribed, is that every thing be done in decency and in order: with what singlenesse and plainenesse may be: without any addition of mens inventions. The Pope carrieth on his Jurisdiction with pompe, and much outward glory; They have commissions, Injunctions, Charters, Seales, Secretaries, Clarks, and a thousand other inventions, to grind the face of the poore. *Episcopacy* hath its Courts, Summons, Clarkes, Seales, with other ceremonies of the like nature.

Christs rule is, that Ministers of equall ranke, shall all have equall power. Apostles indeed were above Evangelists, and Evangelists above Pastors and Teachers: but one Apostle was not above another, nor one Pastor did not superintend another. The Pope hath Priest, Bishop, Archbishop, Primate, Patriarch, Cardinall, Pope. And Episcopacy hath Ministers (now called Priests) Deacons, Bishops, Archbishops, Primates, &c.

The Scripture commandeth Preaching in season, and out of season; but with the Pope, and our Bishops, all preaching is now out of Season, I am sure out of fashion in themselves; and

and cryed downe in others: for with them, Ignorance is the mother of Devotion.

The Scripture alloweth but two Sacraments; the *Pope* addeth five; and our *Bishops* are ambiguous: *Two onely* (they say) are *generally Necessary to Salvation*; which may clearely intimate, that there are *More than two*; though perhaps not absolutely *Necessary* to Salvation, or though necessary, yet not *Generally* necessary, to all men, in all times, states and conditions whatsoever. And so much the Papists yeeld of their five Sacraments, nay, of sixe of their seven: For, onely *Baptisme* (they say) is absolutely and generally necessary to salvation; the *Eucharist* even with them, is not necessary to Infants, much lesse *Matrimony*, *Orders*, *Confirmation*, *Penance*, *Unction*. In what doe our Bishops then differ from Papists in this?

How doe they differ in Baptisme? Both Pope and Bishops hold it necessary, absolutely necessary to salvation. Yea, the most Moderate of Both, maintaine a *generall Baptismall Grace*, Equally confer'd to all partakers of that Sacrament. Indeed Our Bishops doe not openly use *Salt* and *Spittle*, but yet they retaine the *Crosse*, (perhaps much worse) and begin to claime spirituall alliances, as the Papists doe.

In the Lords Supper, the Pope *makes* (rather than *findes*) an *Hostia*, an *Altar*, a *Priest*, asd this Priest must offer for the sins of the Quicke and Dead. Our *Bishops* must have *Priests*, *Altars*, a *Sacrifice*, *Corporals*, and what not that Papists have? to say nothing of their Times and Gestures, which sure the Scripture never so determined, much lesse excluded any that could not yeeld to such and such circumstances, which none ever thought could be more than *Indifferent*.

In all Ordinances the Scripture now speakes of no other Holinesse, than that which is Spirituall, Rationall, the Holinesse of the whole man. The Pope hath found out new Holinesse, which he puts on *Places*, *Times*, *Vestments*, *Bels*, *Tapers*, *Water*, *Wafers*, *Copes*, *Basons*, *Pots*, *and Cups*, with other Vtensles.

And doe not our Bishops so also? What meanes such rigid pressing of Holy daies? Bare heads in Churches? Holy Surplices? What meane they else by their Holy Chalices? Holy Knives? Holy Patents? Holy Vtensles? all which may be so

ſanctified by a devout Prieſt, that they may become profitable to the Soules of thoſe that uſe them. How then doe our Biſhops differ from Papiſts in adminiſtring Sacraments, Manner of all Ordinances?

And is there any greater Difference In *Admiſſion* of *Members*, and *Excommunication*? This laſt being the laſt and greateſt Cenſure of the Church, by both Biſhops and Pope, is made not onely moſt Common (as the humour moves them) but alſo moſt Ridiculous; being the uſuall appendix of one groat ſhort in our Reckonings with our Lord Biſhops Regiſter, Proctor, or Apparitor.

I would not be miſtaken here; I bring not in theſe Things of Doctrine, or Diſcipline, as if by agreeing in One or Many of Theſe, I might convince Biſhops and Papiſts (or the Pope) were all one. The maine thing I drive at in all this, is the Originall fountaine from whence All Theſe ſpring, and all the bankes that keepe in Theſe Rivulets; That vertue and power which moves and actuates all theſe in their proper Channels: And This is *Papall*.

For, what ever the Pope doth of his owne head, by his owne Power, Dictating to his Vaſſals, as Head of the Church, This is truly Papall, and ſuch is the Power by which They uſurpe ſo much over mens perſons, and conſciences, in injoyning and preſſing ſuch or ſuch Doctrine or Diſcipline.

So that a Biſhops wearing a Surplice, Cope, Miter; uſing the Croſſe, Bowing to the Altar, and many ſuch Things (though they may be Errors, yet All Theſe, or One of theſe) makes him not a Pope, a Popeling, or properly Antichriſtian: But Receiving theſe from the Popes Dictates, doing them becauſe he commands, acknowledging his power in commanding; This makes a *Papiſt*: and Commanding them, Preſſing them on Others, in ſuch Deſpoticall power, makes a true *Pope*, a *Reall Antichriſt*.

Nor may Our Biſhops Evade by This (which I eaſily ſee will be anſwered) that though indeed they doe theſe things, and command theſe Things; yet they neither doe them from the *Popes Command*, nor Command them in the *Popes Power*.

Though I ſhould grant This, which yet many wiſe men will not grant, (for, Our Biſhops firſt Power came from the Pope,

Pope, and of late alſo We have found letters, advice, commands, Dictates from the *Pope*, to ſome of our Biſhops; and that in Matters of greateſt Conſequence, both for Church and State; But grant all they ſay, yet they may be Antichriſtian, and ſo ſuch in *Re*, as the *Pope* is; though not literally *Romaniſts*, Except they do, or command, in the power of *Rome*.

This I ſhall be bold to affirme, and maintaine, till I ſee better Reaſon, that He (whoever he be) that commands the leaſt tittle of Doctrine or Diſcipline, meerely *Ex imperio voluntatis*, in his owne Power, and Authority; without Licence or Warrant from Scripture or Right Reaſon, (where the Scripture hath beene ſilent) though the Thing he ſo commands ſhould happen to be good in it ſelfe: Yet He in his ſo commanding, is not onely *Tyrannicall*, but *Antichriſtian*, properly *Antichriſtian*; Encroaching on the Royall Office of Chriſt, which is truely High Treaſon againſt God; and moſt properly *Antichriſtianiſme*. I care not whether we call him a *Pope*, *Papiſt*, *Romaniſt*, or any other name; I call him *Antichriſt*: and if you will call *Antichriſt* by the name of *Pope*, I call ſuch an Imperious Commander amongus, (though he have no ſhadow of Dependance on Rome, or Romiſh Pope) an Engliſh *Pope*, I meane an Engliſh *Antichriſt*.

I need not ſpend much time in ſhewing by what *meanes* either the Pope or our Biſhops began, and continued to be ſo Antichriſtian: *Du Pleſſis* and Others have ſav'd me this labour. In a word, they have beene Theſe. With one hand they have laid pillowes under Princes, and all Governours (appointed by God) that ſo they might fall ſoftly, while they thruſt them downe with the other (the ſtronger) Hand, Arme and all. When Theſe have beene ſo ſurely, though gently, laid downe aſleepe; They have beene bold to tread on them, (yet with Pluſh ſlippers, leſt they ſhould chance to wake, ſtirre, and get up againe) and by Them, as ſo many ſtaires or ſteppes, mount up themſelves into this Height of Tyranny. Thus have they ſtill *oppoſed, and advanced* themſelves, againſt and above All that is called *God*, or is *worſhipped*. And If with your owne thoughts you will pleaſe to goe on in the Chapter, you will finde ſome other *Media* (as Lying Wonders, and others) by which they have aſcended.

I ſhall not neede to parallel Popiſh and Epiſcopall *Media* to Their Height. All the world ſees them now, For, they were not done in a Corner.

What meanes their crying up an unjuſt and illimited power in Princes? Is not This their bleating out of an illegall unwarranted Prerogative (with which all our pulpits have rung of late) intended to tickle Princes till they be luld aſleepe? or to ſow pillowes under them, till They themſelves can thruſt them downe; not onely from that Tyranny which Biſhops would perſwade them to uſurp; but alſo from their wholſome and lawfull prerogative?

What meaneth their Buzzing in Princes Eares, That Kings cannot ſtand without ſuch Biſhops? that if they ſhould be put downe, the Church, and State too, muſt needs be Ruined? to This purpoſe they cry Blood, Blood; They can never fall without Blood: ſo ſome of them have vaunted. But Let them remember what Chriſt ſaid to One (to whom they ſo much pretend) *He that ſmiteth with the ſword, ſhall periſh by the ſword.* They know alſo whoſe Coat was ſent home to their Holy Father, with this Inſcription (written with his owne blood) *Judge Holy Father whether This be Thy Sonnes Coat or not.*

I have not forgotten how they have dealt with the People, Miniſtry, Gentry, Nobility, All ſorts of men: For they have many ſtaires to ſtep up by, to ſuch an Height; but Princes are their higheſt ſteps, their firſt Aime.

That which they have moſt ſounded in the Peoples Eares, is the Church, the Church, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord! by This, as by a ſtalking horſe, they have come much neerer then elſe they could. But now their Vizard beginnes to fall off; and Men beginne to ſee the true power of the True Church; and the Tyranny of that Antichriſtian Mock-Church; which under the Maske of *Indifference*, hath brought in moſt abominable Superſtitions, and moſt intolerable ſlavery on the Perſons, Liberties, Bodies, and *Soules of Men.* For they have preſſed Conſciences, even unto Gaſping: yea, and would not be ſatisfied, though they daily heard the ſighes and groanes of thoſe bleeding hearts, which themſelves had ſtabd with the poyſoned ſword of *Church-Indifference.*

Indeed they have uſed Both hands, and have ſtricken with Both.

Both. What the *Keyes* could not break, the *Sword* hath cut. And it had been much more tolerable, If This Sword had pierced no farther then the Eares of Men: with which they have yet beene much more busie then He was, whom they bragge to have beene their first Predecessor. Yet me thinkes it was a sad Omen that this Sword should cut off the Eare of *Malchus*, which signifies (they say) a *King*, or *Kingly Authority*. At This they strike indeed, through the Eares, and Hearts of so many Loyall Subjects.

We neede not seeke their End, in all This. It cannot be doubted, but by all These *Memes*, they aime at One End, (which is also the *Popes*) to pull downe all Other Power, and set up their owne. Thus, Thus they *Oppose*, and *Exalt* themselves above *All* that is called *God*, or is *Worshipped*; as is more fully represented in another place of this Discourse.

Now let any man Living speake: Are These Bishops, These Usurping Prelates to be suffered in a Church, or State, where there is any respect to Right, Church Government, or True State Policie? since it is Evident They are truly *Papall*, most properly *Antichristian*; and as Antichrist, must Oppose and Exalt themselves above all that is Worshipped, or Called God: Which is most True *Popery*, (as hath beene demonstrated) And as Popery, Destructive to all Church and State-Policie.

Doubtlesse some such Apprehensions as This, wrought in their Breasts, who being offered, have refused Bishopricks; and being possessed, could not rest till they had *Dis-invested* themselves againe.

Histories are full of forraine and Domesticke Examples of This subject. Such was *Niceph. Blemmides* chosen Patriarch of *Constantinople*. *Weringhaldius* chosen Bishop of *Triers*. *Theophilus* Bishop of *Adiana*. *Aminonius* cut off his Eare, (being Bishop) that so he might be uncapable of That Function. *Eugenius* (the Philosopher) left his Ministery rather than he would bee a Bishop. *Bassianes* an Elected Bishop, was by *Memnon* whipped before the Altar (three houres together) because he would not be made a Bishop. *Adrian* (with us) refused the Archbishopricke of *Canterbury*, being pressed thereunto. Two or Three Popes might come into this

Catalogue; *Clement* the firſt was One: *Et quis fuit Alter?* Shall I name *Marcellus?* He neither refuſed, nor reſigned the *Papacie*; yet ſolemnely profeſſed *he ſaw not how Thoſe that poſſeſſed ſuch high places could bee ſaved.*

O but had Theſe piouſly conſidered what good they might have done in ſuch high places, or duely remembred their Owne, or their friends, advancement, they could never have done This: But *Ignoti nulla cupido*, Men deſire not what they are ignorant of.

For anſwer to This Objection, I ſhall give you ſome inſtances of Thoſe that have reſigned up their Biſhopricks after they had held them long enough for a full Tryall. Yea perhaps there be more of This kinde than of the other, though the Proverbe be, *Ægrius Ejicitur quam non admittitur Hoſpes*, It is harder to throw out a man, than at firſt to keepe him out.

Of Theſe were *Vlbranius* Biſhop of *Sheturæ*, *Arnulphus* Biſhop of *Ments*, *Addo* Biſhop of *Lions*, *Vicerbus* Biſhop of *Ratisbone*, *Henger* Biſhop of *Ments*, *Michael* Biſhop of *Epheſius*, with many more.

Amongſt our Owne was *Edmund Boniface*, and *Robert Kalwarby*, (Both Arch-Biſhops of *Canterbury*) *Will. Beavoſe* and *William De Sancta Maria* (Biſhops of *London.*) One of *Lincoln*, and Two of *Coventry*. I may adde *Miles Coverdale*, who being deprived in Queene *Maries* dayes would not be re-inveſted in Queene *Elizabeths*, but taught a Schoole. There is One Pope *Cornelius*: And *Gregory* the Great, muſt not be forgotten; who ſaid, *He that affects the Primacie of the whole Church, muſt be Antichriſt, or His Predeceſſor.*

If ſome few *Walloons*, or men of *Geneva*, ſhould declaime againſt *Epiſcopacie*, They would prevaile but little, becauſe it would be ſaid of Them, perhaps (as of That great diſturber of the Church of old) *Inſaniunt, quia non ſunt Epiſcopi*, They rage, becauſe themſelves are not Biſhops: But now *Ex Ore Tuo judicaberis*, Your owne mouths ſhall condemne you. Biſhops contend with Biſhops: not with Words, but Deeds. I beſeech you conſider that Fleſh and Blood is not wont to refuſe, or part with ſuch great Advantages: Sure we may conclude there is ſomewhat that ſtings within, *Latet Anguis in Herba*,

There

There is a Snake under the greene Graſſe. Theſe Good men, doubtleſſe, found a Sting, and they would not kicke againſt Prickes.

When Saint *Paul* (a Great *Philoſopher*) bids us beware leſt we be entangled with *Philoſophy*: When *Solomon* (who had taſted all the dainty Cates Nature could provide or dreſſe) cries out, *All is Vanity, All is Vanity*: When Biſhops themſelves (who have fully enjoyed all the ſweetneſſe a Biſhops Honour can afford) ſhall pauſe and cry, It is Enough, It is Enough, *Non iterum bibam venenum*, I will drinke poyſon no more, (as once *Diocleſian*, of his *Empire*) Sure there muſt be ſomething worth reflecting on; a faire warning for our Preſent or Future Biſhops.

O you Judges of the Earth, why will you not be wiſe? O you Senators (for ſuch our Biſhops are) why will you not learne Wiſedome? God forbid that of You ſhould be ſaid (what the Spirit ſpeaketh of ſome) *Why ſhould they be ſmitten, They rebell more and more? Why ſhould they be reproved, They will ſtill doe fooliſhly*?

Yet but for a little while; For I am confident yet, within *few Yeares*, if not *Moneths*, if not *Dayes*, the God of Peace and Truth will deliver his Church of This heavy yoke, from which (with the *Letany* Give me leave to conclude) Good Lord deliver us.

SECTION II.

Considereth how Consonant such *Episcopacy* is either to sound *Antiquity* or *Scripture*.

CHAP. I.

Some Antiquities produced by a late most learned and Reverend Patron of Episcopacy, *are discussed.*

HAving cleerely proved how uncompatible *Our Episcopacy* is to Civill Government in *State Policy*; let us now consider whether it may shelter it selfe under the Mysterious Covert of *Antiquity*.

I could heartily wish, that in matters which receive their being from *Scripture*, so immediately as Church Discipline doth, wee might make the *Scripture* (which is a sufficient rule) our sole guide, our sole moderator. But as Heretickes in the day of Judgement shall cry to the mountaines to cover them; so Heresies now also, fly to the craggy rockes of remotest times: and in such darke corners hope to shelter themselves.

Thither also we will follow them, *quo fata trahunt*, whither their destiny drives them, we will advance. Not doubting but to unkennell those little Foxes: hoping even with *Goliah*'s sword to lay *Goliah* in the dust, and bring the five uncircum-

cised Princes of the *Canaanites*, to their just censure, before the King or Captaines of the *Israelites*.

There is a most Reverend man, famous for learning, (especially for that learning which is not open to every eye) hath taken upon him the defense of this Cause: I shall therefore in few words present to Him my thoughts upon those His determinations; Concluding with *Philip* of *Macedon*, that if I can but win the *chiefe City*, the whole Countrey is gained: Then I shall see, whether Those things which are pressed by others, be not altogether ineffectuall to determine the point which they dispute. And so I shall leave the decision of This, to the judgement and opinion of the learned.

Before I consider that Treatise in the parts of it, give mee leave to say that which is most true, and I hope will satisfie all men. If every word of that his booke were true; yet it is little to the point: For the Question is not, Whether there have been Bishops ever since Christs time; but, Whether these have had power over their brethren: or, Whether one Bishop hath had Jurisdiction over another. And this Question is double.

First, Whether they have had any superintendence one above another.

Secondly, Whether this hath beene mixt with that Lordlinesse which now is used; forcing obedience by the edge of the Sword, where the Keyes can give no entrance: And of this, in the whole booke there is not the least hint, *ne gry quidem*. Though this also were not enough for our Question; which is not only of their Lordly power in *Ecclesiasticis*, but also in *Civilibus*.

In the first Querie, we shall quickly joyne issue; agreeing with our Antagonists, that there have beene Bishops (*viz.* Ministers of the Gospel) who have had a Scripture power in matter of Government, over particular flocks: but the other wee doe absolutely and confidently deny.

First, he endeavoureth to prove the succession of seven and twenty Bishops, in the seat of *Timothy*: and this he essayeth by one single (not to say simple) witnesse, a certaine man named *Leontius*; whose writings have not delivered him famous to us for learning, nor his exemplary holinesse (mentioned by others) famous for piety. Truly

Truly, a man of greater authority than he, (as *Papias*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarpus*, who, almoſt all, knew the Apoſtles) ſhall not be of credit ſufficient to ſway my faith in this point: Not but that they were moſt worthy men; but becauſe all Antiquity hath paſſed the refining pot of the *Index expurgatorius*, I ſhall conſider well, before I ſubſcribe. And ſhall I then give credit to an unknowne Author, in theſe things that were acted almoſt five hundred yeares before his birth? Let the world judge whether it be equall.

Neither is this Author quoted, from witneſſe of his owne; but out of a Councell. Now how Councells have beene abuſed, thoſe who have ever had place or note in great Aſſemblies, can too well tell: where there is almoſt no *Order* drawne up, but after a ſerious review, reducing the miſtakes of the Clerkes, to the ſenſe of thoſe who did frame the *Order*, which might elſe come forth diſorderly.

By what I have already ſaid, That other teſtimony brought from a fatherleſſe Treatiſe of *Timothy*'s Martyrdome, cited only by *Photius*, (a learned man, who lived ſeven or eight Centuries after Chriſt) will be of no weight: for *Photius* doth but ſay he read it. Hear-ſay in matter of judicature is no good teſtimony: and reports in matter of opinion, at the ſecond hand, are good to amuſe thoſe who deifie venerable Antiquity; but will never edifie thoſe who deſire to bottome their reſolutions upon ſound Reaſon.

The teſtimonies of *Felix*, *John* of *Antioch*, and *Theodore*, are not of age ſufficient to be regiſtred among the Ancients, or to bee valued becauſe they are old. I confeſſe, I ſet a greater value upon *Ignatius* and *Irenaus*, who affirme, *Polycarpus* was made Biſhop of *Smyrna*, by St. *John*; but this muſt not be of undeniable authority.

For of *Ignatius* I ſhall affirme this, that All thoſe who are any whit learned in Antiquity, know that five of his Epiſtles are ſpurious; and how unmingled thoſe are which we allow to be his, we doe not know, who looke upon Antiquity at ſuch a diſtance. But allow it to bee true, that *Oneſimus* was Biſhop of *Epheſus*, *Polycarpus* Biſhop of *Smyrna*, *&c.* This may be true, but evinceth in no meaſure the Queſtion in diſ-

pute ; Which is not of a Biſhop in generall, but ſuch a Biſhop.

The Authority of *Tertullian* alſo, is of the ſame credit : Hee tells us that *Polycarpus* was placed by Saint *John* at *Smyrna*; and at *Rome Clement* by Saint *Peter*. This no body will diſpute (though I am not bound to beleeve it.) But where is the ſtreſſe of this Argument?

In the laſt place, that of *Clement Alexandrinus* is as much queſtioned as all the reſt. But allow it to bee true, that *John* did appoint Biſhops, they have gained nothing; for I ſhall allow that Chriſt alſo hath inſtituted Biſhops, and that Biſhops are *Jure divino* ; yea, I will allow that they are to feed *Chriſts* flocke, to rule *Chriſts* inheritance, in *Chriſts* ſenſe: but I ſhall never allow of theſe Biſhops, which are now the ſubject of our diſpute.

There are *Three ſorts* of Biſhops, as *Beza* ſaith : There are of *Gods Inſtitution*, and they are thoſe who have a power over their proper flock, with the reſt of the Church, and no other. There are alſo of *Mans Inſtitution* ; and this ever overfloweth into the Neighbour Pariſh. And laſtly, there is a *Demonicall Biſhop* ; and this is he who challengeth the Sword, as well as the Keyes.

This laſt may well be ſtiled *Demonicall*; for ſure God never erected this order ; nor *Man* in his right ſenſes : Where it will then fixe, is cleere enough. Even on him, Whoſe darke Myſteries, moſt of theſe men have beene very well acquainted with.

The long Robe and the Sword doe not well agree. To ſee a Lawyer tyed to his Sword till he put off his Gowne, is not ſo comely ; but to ſee a paire of Lawne ſleeves to ſtifle a Scepter, if it were but on a ſtage, I would cry out, *Spectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis*, Can you ſee it, and not burſt out into laughter?

SECT.

Sect. II. Chap. II.

Our Bishops Election, Delegation, *&c. examined by* Antiquity.

THus having run through that little Treatise, (yet with some wonder, that a person of his profession, piety, and knowne learning should doe that, which might in any sense seeme to impose on those whom hee loveth) I proceed to some other things, which I finde produced from Antiquity, by the greatest Patrons of that kinde of *Episcopacy* which we now oppose.

Yet by the way, I must note here also, That either none seeme to state the Question (betweene us) right; or else, all seeme to desert it.

Our Question (as I have often said) is not of the name of *Bishop* or his power in *Ecclesiasticalls* only; but also, and mainly of his *Civill* power, and *Temporalls*. Which all the Patrons of *Episcopacy* seeme to shun, as a dangerous Rock; and hovering aloofe off, goe about to prove by Antiquity, that Bishops had this *Name*, and some power even in the Primitive Church; which (though I thinke none can force me to beleeve, yet) I dispute not; But demand whether any Bishops had *such* power in *Ecclesiasticis*, *& Civilibus*, as ours now have in *England*.

Yet, because they insist so much on Antiquity, for *Ecclesiasticall Episcopacy*, I will be content to follow them there also; beleeving we shall finde no one foot-step (in true Antiquity) of such a Bishop as wee now have established in *England*, though we should strip him of all Civill power, and consider him only in *Ecclesiasticis*.

Shall I begin with his *Election*? which indeed is somewhat higher than they use (perhaps dare) to begin. I can produce many Antiquities to prove the *Election* of all *Church Officers*, was in the People; yea, and that for divers ages after the Apostles; who indeed at first appointed these themselves: and good reason why, when there were no People to choose their *Officers*,

till converted by the Apostles; who afterward left *This* Power to the *Whole Church*, rightly constituted. And this continued in the *Church* for divers ages: as appeares by *Constantines* Epistle to the Church of *Nice*; *Athanasius* also *ad Orthodoxos*; And Saint *Cyprians* sixth Epistle; with many instances more, which might be, and daily are produced.

It is true, that after the Apostles, and purer times of the Church were gone, the Clergy began to lord it over the people, and to bereave them of their due priviledge; yea, oft times agreed among themselves to choose One Superintendent (as we may call him) whom they called Father, and Bishop; and in this perhaps they did not amisse, if this Bishops power rested only on the Clergy, and never reached to the people; who else sure by all reason should have had a vote in choosing any Officer, much more such a great Commander.

But let all the Patrons of Episcopacy produce me one sound Antiquity for such Election, as is now in use with us. Let them from undoubted Antiquity for three hundred yeares after Christ, (nay much more, for I easily see their evasion) let them, I say, shew me but one instance of our *Conge d' eslire*: It is the thing I speake of, not the Word.

Let them shew me (except in the darke times of Popery) power given to ten or twelve Men (except all the Clergy explicitely consented) to choose such a Bishop. And yet this is not halfe that which lies in our Elections; which indeed are not at all made, by so much, as the Chapiter of any Cathedrall, but received only by those who dare not refuse it: but of this I spake before in the first Section.

I am Content to passe their Election, (which I perceive none of them care much to examine;) and come to the Execution of their Office. In which I might instance in two or three maine points; as sole Ordination, sole Jurisdiction, Delegation, &c.

I meet with none that take upon them to defend this last; which as a Great Statesman observed many yeares since, was a thing at first view, most monstrous, and unreasonable. For, will any man living thinke it reasonable my Lord Keeper should, *ad placitum*, delegate whom hee will to keepe the Seale,

Seale, and judge in Chancery, without consent of his Majesty and the State, that entrusteth him with this great Office? Yet *These Men* hold it fit to entrust a *Vicar-Generall*, *Chancellors*, *Officialls*, *Surrogates*, (and yet under-*Officers*) to keepe the Seale, yea, weild the Scepter of Christ, and all the *Church*, which yet they say is entrusted with them. But with whom have they left the sheepe in the Wildernesse? Were there nothing else but this, I cannot but hold our *Episcopacy* an intolerable *Tyranny*; seeing a Bishops Dog, (I am not much amisse) lording it over the People, Ministers, Gentry, Nobility, All: while his Master is perhaps Revelling, Dicing, or doing worse; for worse they doe.

Nor is this any way to be helped, while to one Lord Bishop is granted so vast a Territory; which yet hee commandeth as absolutely under that most significant terme of *Diocesan*, *Primate*, or *Metropolitan*, as any Temporall Prince can doe, by the name of Earle, Duke, King, Emperor, or any other.

I oft remember the dry Oxe-hide, that was brought to represent *Alexanders* great Dominions: But I see them so farre from standing on the middle, (to keep downe all) that indeed they oft touch it not at all; but are acting the Lord Temporall (I might say more) remote enough from their own *Diocesse*.

Which yet of it selfe is oft so large, that no one man living could sufficiently *Visit* and *Over-see* it, except he could get the *Pope* to *Transubstantiate* him also, and so get a *Ubiquitarian* Body. To supply which he is oft forced to puffe up his wide sleeves, and looke very big: And yet much, yea most of all his Office, must be done by *Delegates*; who are oft, yea usually the lowest dregs of basest men.

In good earnest, I would thanke any man, that can shew me one good Antiquity to countenance such *Delegation* of an entrusted Office, to Deputies, specially to such Deputies, as themselves doe not, cannot trust.

Doth any man dare, or can any man thinke it fit, to *Delegate* the Tuition or Education of a tender Prince, committed to his Charge or Care, by his Royall Father? I beseech you; Is not the flocke of Christ stiled by the Spirit of Christ, *An Holy Priest-hood*, *a Royall People*? Shall it then be fit, or lawfull,

lawfull for any man to tranſmit this truſt to any whomſoever? eſpecially to ſuch a crue of faithleſſe Hirelings? God forbid.

SECT. II. CHAP. III.

Of Ordination, *whether proper onely to* Biſhops: *or equally committed to all* Presbyters: *diſcuſſed by Ancient Authorities.*

I Shall paſſe their *Sole Juriſdiction* alſo, being the Common Theme of all that write of this Queſtion; ſpecially when I finde ſome of themſelves diſclaime that Epithet of *Sole*: and if they can be content to leave this out, I have leſſe to ſpeake againſt them.

We come to *Ordination*; or to ſpeake as they uſe, (though ſome of them love not to heare of it) *Sole Ordination*. This is the maine and Maſter-piece of all *Epiſcopacy*. All things elſe in the Church, they yeeld equally committed to Presbyters; onely *Impoſition of Hands*, they ſay, is ſolely retained to the Biſhop; ſo *Downham*, *Bilſon*, and of late one of their owne, that offers to yeeld the Cauſe, for one example of Lawfull *Ordination* by Presbyters without a Biſhop.

One example? what dare he ſay, *France*, *Belgium*, no parts of *Germany* hath *Lawfull Ordination*, though by ſole Presbyters, without Biſhops? *Downham* is ſomewhat more moderate, and yeelds ſuch Orders Lawfull; but in caſe of Neceſſity, or at leaſt ſome great Exigency: in which he hath the *Charity* to include the Reformed Churches abroad, though as he ſaith, *They are of age*, and might ſpeake for themſelves.

But they urge us to ſhew *Antiquity* allowing any ſuch *Ordination* without a Biſhop. It hath beene ſhewed, and yet never anſwerd (that I know) that ſome Councels have intimated enough; *Presbyters* were wont of old to *Ordaine* without Biſhops.

As that of *Ancyra*, *Can.* 13. *It ſhall not bee lawfull for Choriepiſcopi, or Presbyters to Ordaine, without conſent of the Biſhop,* ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ, In another Pariſh (for ſo the words are in *Balſamon*, though ſome of themſelves tranſlate the words very ſtrangely.) Which cleerely intimates, That before this Canon, *Presbyters* and *Choriepiſcopi* who had not ſtill *Ordination*,

nation from three Biſhops, though ſome had ſo,) did uſually *Ordain* without the Biſhops leave, (much more without his preſence;) and that too in Other pariſhes beſides their Own; Elſe it is ſtrange the Councell ſhould now forbid it, if It had never been done before. Nay, the Canon doth not now abſolutely forbid it, (which is much to be marked) but onely commands, the Biſhops leave ſhould be asked to all ſuch *Ordinations*. But if This *Impoſition of hands* were a *Sole* property of Biſhops, (as now ſome make it) the Biſhop could not give leave, or depute others to do it. For, This, even among themſelves is a received Axiome, *Epiſcopus poteſt delegare ea quæ ſunt Juriſdictionis, non ea quæ ſunt Ordinis*, A Biſhop may delegate thoſe things which concern Juriſdiction, but not thoſe things which concern Order.

Hitherto alſo may be referred all thoſe Canons that require Preſbyters to *Lay on their hands* with the Biſhop in *Ordination:* As *Can. 3. Concil. Carth.* about the year 418. and that of *Aken*, 400. years after: Yea, and this was the practice of the Church in St *Cyprians* time, as appears by his 6. and 58. *Epiſt.* So *Jerome* in his Epiſtle to *Rome*; and St *Ambroſe* among his Epiſtles *Book* 10. Yea, and This is our Law alſo; which requires *Coadjutors* to Biſhops in *Ordination:* Conſonant doubtleſſe to the moſt Ancient practice of the Primitive Church, even in the Apoſtles Times; as appears by that of *Paul* to *Timothy*, on whom were laid the *Hands* of the Preſbytery; not of the Presbyterate, or one Presbyter, as learned Maſter *Thorndick* not onely yeelds, but proves; who yet is no enimy to Biſhops.

Neither could I ever finde one good Antiquity againſt *Ordination* by Presbyters, or for *Sole Ordination* by Biſhops. I finde indeed *Collythus*, and ſome others, Unprieſted by Councels, becauſe *Ordained* by Presbyters alone; but That Act of the Presbyters was done in faction, againſt the Biſhop, and their fellow Brethren. Yea, and in moſt caſes, if not in all, Thoſe *Orders* (ſo annuiled by Councels) were conferred by one Prieſt alone, and ſo were indeed as unlawfull, as if by one Biſhop alone.

I might adde, that ſome Great men of good Note, have ſtrongly maintained, all thoſe Councels erred, which ſo Unprieſted Thoſe that had been *Ordained* by a Prebyter, or Presbyters, without a Biſhop. Amongſt Theſe are ſome of Note in the Popiſh Church; It being a Common Inſtance among the School-men, diſputing,

Whether *Orders* once confer'd could be annul'd; and they all conclude the contrary. Yea, and many of these also strongly prove that Priests may as well *Ordaine* as Bishops; and their Reason seemes very good; for, say they, Seeing a Priest can Consecrate, and by Consecration Transubstantiate, (which is more,) Why can he not also Administer the Sacrament of *Orders*, which is lesse?

Yea, and some of them dare affirme, Neither Bishop nor Pope can licence Priests to give *Ordination*, except the Power of *Ordination* be *de jure*, in Presbyters: For they all yeeld the Pope himselfe cannot licence one that is not a Priest, to Consecrate the *Hoste*; because none but Priests have that Power of Consecration. And a Licence doth not confer *Orders* without *Imposition of hands*, as they all grant.

For my owne part, I ever thought that of *Bucer* most Rationall, *Deus non simpliciter singularibus Personis, sed* Ecclesiæ *Ordinandi potestatem tradidit*, God hath not committed the Power of Ordination to *particular Persons*, but to the *Church*. For so indeed it seemes the Worke of the whole Church, who are to *Elect*, to testifie also, and seale their Election by *Laying on their hands*: And the Presbytery are but the Churches servants in this Act. I could heartily wish it were reduced to this againe, which I fully conceive to be most agreeable to Right Reason, Scripture, and All Good (untainted) Antiquity. Yet till this be againe restored, I much desire the Prelates would leave off some of the *Ceremonies*, which I heare they use in it, (though not by Law I thinke,) lest they drive all good men from taking *Orders*.

Sect. II. Chap. IV.

Of the Name *and* Office *of a* Bishop *in* Scripture. *How little or how much the Scripture makes for, or against Bishops: Divers Texts are discussed.*

I Shall now passe from this kinde of Church Antiquity, and passe to the best Antiquity, the infallible Truth of God, in Holy *Scripture*. In it I shall shew there is little for, much against Bishops; whether we consider the *Name* or *Office* of a Bishop, as now it is setled.

The *Name* I finde but foure times in all the New Testament: In two of which, the *Name* is so indifferently used, that it maketh nothing

nothing towards an iſſue of this Queſtion. Thoſe are, 1 *Tim.*3. *verſe* 1,2,3. and 1 *Pet.* 2.25. And what can be gained from hence, truely I ſee not.

In the other places it maketh againſt them, as I ſhall ſhew more at large by and by.

But the Word *Elder*, (a true Biſhop) is uſed twenty ſeverall times in the New Teſtament. And you ſhall finde the Apoſtles honouring this *Name* ſo much, that one of them ſtiles himſelfe an *Elder*, but none calls himſelfe a Biſhop. Indeed *Judas* is ſo called; Who (as it were Prophetically) behaved himſelfe ſo, that his *Arch-Biſhopricke* was given to another. I doubt not but the Spirit fore-ſaw this Word would be quickly mounted high enough; ſo that it brands *Judas* firſt with this ſtile.

Of much more Majeſty is the Word *Presbyter*, which ſignifies *Senior*. Under the Law Youth was bound to pay Tribute to Gray haires; and *Senatus* of old was ſo ſtiled, *à Senioribus*; Whereas *Epiſcopus* ſignifies nothing but an *Over-ſeer*: And ſuch indeed Biſhops have beene for many yeares.

Perhaps the Name of Biſhop is ſometimes (though rarely) uſed, that the wilfully blinde might ſtumble: But the Name Preſbyter very frequent; that thoſe who love Truth and Light, might ſtill ſee ſuch a Glympſe that might Enlighten them in the midſt of Egyptian darkneſſe: from which, I doubt not, but God will deliver all Chriſtendome in due time.

I can finde as little alſo for the *Office* of a Biſhop, as for his *Name* in Scripture, yea much leſſe. I can finde our Saviour rebuking his Diſciples, ſtriving for precedency, ſaying, *Hee that will be firſt ſhall be laſt*. I can finde St. *Peter* ſaying, *Lord it not over the flocke of Chriſt*: And St. *John* branding *Diotrephes* with ſeeking the *Preheminence*.

But where ſhall we finde the uſurped *Office* of our Biſhops in all the Scripture? can they finde it (by a multiplying glaſſe) where ever they ſee the *Name* of Biſhop, though but in a Poſtſcript, of Saint *Pauls* Epiſtles, Whither I ſee many of them fly for their owne Name?

I muſt confeſſe I have found ſome *Praſcripts* of *Davids* Pſalmes (and other Texts) to bee now part of Scripture; but never yet found any *Poſtſcript* of ſuch Authority. I dare not therefore give it unto theſe;

Which, firſt, were never (that I could learne) received by the Church for *Authentick* Scripture; nor ever fully joyned to the Scripture, but by ſome diſtinctive note, till our Biſhops times. Yea, ſome antient Copies have them not at all; as one very old Greeke Copy in Oxford Library, if I be not miſ-informed.

Againe, theſe *Poſtſcripts* have many Improbabilities, and ſome repugnancies, as many learned men obſerve.

As that of the firſt to *Timothy*; *From Laodicea the chiefeſt City of Phrygia Pacatiana.* Which ſure was never ſo ſubſcribed by Saint *Paul*, who would not have ſpoken of a Firſt Epiſtle, when as yet there was no ſecond, nor appearance of any. Againe, the Epithet *Pacatiana* came from *Pacatianus* a Roman Deputy, 300. yeares after Saint *Paul* wrote.

The Epiſtle to *Titus* is thus ſubſcribed, (or rather ſuperſcribed,) *To Titus, ordained the firſt Biſhop of Creet; from Nicopolis of Macedonia*: but it ſhould have been added; *Whither Saint Paul meant to come after the Epiſtle, but was not there at his writing*; as appeares very probably from the third of the ſame Epiſtle, *verſe* 12. But what meanes that Phraſe, Biſhop of the *Church* in *Creet*? was there but one *Church* in all *Creet*? This ſounds not like the Scripture ſtile; which alwaies expreſſeth Nationall Congregations by *Churches* in the *Plurall*. But it may very well be, *Titus* was Biſhop (or Paſtor) but of one *Church* in *Creet*: ſo that we ſhall not need to contend about this.

Our Adverſaries themſelves yeeld, there cannot be much urged from theſe *Subſcriptions*. *Baronius*, *Serrarius*, and the *Rhemiſts*, will ingenuouſly confeſſe ſo much; and Biſhop *Whitgift* alſo againſt Mr. *Cartwright*.

The *Poſtſcripts* failing, where will they ſhew either *Name* or *Office* of a *Biſhop* as now it is uſed? I know their ſtrong Fort, *Tit.* 1.5. *For this cauſe I left thee in Creet, that thou ſhouldeſt ſet in order the things that are wanting, and ordaine Elders in every City, &c.* Here they thinke the power of a Biſhop is ſet forth at large.

But what if ſo? Will they be content to be limited to this power? if ſo, we ſhall the ſooner agree. I thinke no man ever thought, good *Titus* had a Commiſſion here to draw the *Civill Sword*; or ſo much as to ſtrike with his *Church Keyes*.

Let us a little examine this *Commiſſion*; which ſeemes but a Briefe of a larger Patent which Saint *Paul* had given him before.

If

If we first examine the Date of this *Commission*, we shall finde it before any Church Government was setled; and so an Extraordinary Case, not fit, perhaps not lawfull, to be produced as a constant president.

Extraordinary Cases of Necessity, breake through the *Ceremoniall*, yea, *Morall Law* too. The Shew-Bread may refresh fainting *David*; *Cain* and *Abel* may marry their owne sisters to propagate the World; *Samuel* may be a Priest, though not of *Aarons* House, as was shewed before. And why then may not an Extraordinary way be taken in the first setling of Church Government, where there is yet none setled? Any man might now in the conversion of the *Americans*, or *Chinois*, give direction how to admit Members, elect Pastors, exercise the keyes, &c. This *Titus* did, and no more.

But secondly, in what manner his Commission was, I know not; and nothing can be proved from hence, til that be agreed upon. It is as probable he did it but *instructivè, exhortativè*, and not *imperativè*, by way of instruction, and exhortation, not by way of command.

Timothy received his gift by imposition of Presbyteriall hands. If an extraordinary gift was conveyed in an ordinary way, Why might not an ordinary calling, and affaires of an ordinary nature, be managed by an extraordinary man, be carried forth in an extraordinary way? The contrary is not proved, and so this must till then, be Ineffectuall to them.

But thirdly, and lastly, I beseech you consider by what power he did it: by the power of an *Evangelist*. There are two sorts of them,

1. Who write.

2. Who proclaime the Gospell in an extraordinary way, as co-adjutors and messengers to the Apostles in this great worke.

Of this last sort certainely he was *. A Bishop he was not; for our adversaries doe all agree, that it is the duty of a Bishop *curæ sux incumbere*, to watch over his charge: now this he did not, for if *Creet* was his Charge (which in no way, neither by Scripture nor Antiquity is proved) he did not attend it; for we finde him continually journeying up and downe; he leaveth *Creet* and commeth to *Ephesus*, from thence he is sent to *Corinth*, after that into *Macedonia*, from *Macedonia* he is returned to the *Corin-*

* See 2. Cor. 8. 23.

thians. Neither is it to be found in History, that he ever returned to *Creet.* Thus, if I mistake not, the Text is lesse advantageous than the Postscript.

Some think to find Episcopacy established in that example of S. *John*, writing to the *Angels* of the seven Churches. But this is *Argumentum longè petitum*, a far fetcht argument.

Because *Paul* endorseth the Letter of a Corporation, or an Assembly, to the most eminent man in the Congregation; Therefore he shall have sole Jurisdiction; therefore the Mayor shall have sole power without the Aldermen; *Est par ratio*, The reason is the same.

When *Paul* writes to the Church of the Thessalonians (1 *Thess.* 5.v.27.) commanding That Epistle to be read to all the holy Brethren; the Church of the Thessalonians should have Jurisdiction over other Churches: which truly I do not think to be a strong Argumentation.

Secondly, the Word is taken collectively for the Assembly and charge of Ministers, and not for One, as appeareth evidently *Rev.* 2.v.24.) He saith, speaking to the Angel, *To you*, and to the rest in *Thyatira*: he puts the *Angel* in the plurall number, which he would not have done, had he written to a single Bishop.

Thirdly, these Epistles are written to the whole Church for the threats and promises are read to them, and the *Epiphonema* of every Epistle is this, He that hath an eare let him hear what is spoken to the Churches.

But yet if this superscription could give any advantage to the Angel, it would but extend to his own congregation.

The *Laodicean Angel* hath no influence upon the *Philadelphian* or the *Smyrnite*; & if that be not proved, nothing is gained in the point of Episcopacy, except it could be proved, that these Angels had in their care many congregations under these particular Churches: which never hath, nor ever will appear. I hope it is manifest to all men that they cannot establish *Episcopacy* by Scripture.

Secondly, there is much in Scripture against them; For the word *Elder* and *Bishop* is all one, *Tit.*1.*ver.*7. *For this cause left I thee in Creet, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee; for a Bishop must be blamelesse, as the Steward of God.*

First,

First, he sheweth *Titus* what manner of man an Elder must be, *viz. Blameleſſe*; and now proveth it, becauſe a Biſhop muſt be blameleſſe. As if I ſhould write to *Thomas* to live ſoberly, becauſe a *Man* muſt be ſober; it neceſſarily followeth that *Thomas* is a man.

So that *Phil.* 1. he writes to the Biſhops and Deacons at *Philippi*. Is it probable that a little Towne in *Macedonia* ſhould have many *Biſhops*, when one Biſhop muſt have many Cities in his Dioceſſe? Thoſe *Who tranſlated the Bible*, foreſaw This: And therefore *Acts* 20. They have tranſlated the word *Epiſcopus* an *Over-ſeer*. Yet in other places they tranſlate it *Biſhop*. And the Jeſuites ſay, *Pia fraudes ſunt licita*, Honeſt craft is lawfull.

The carriage of the Apoſtles, in ſeverall places is remarkable: when they come to a City (as *Act.* 20.) They ſend for the *Elders* of the Church, never thinking of a *Biſhop*, he is ſo inconſiderable a man. Theſe places I hope make cleerly againſt them; So now I will endevour to ſhew what the Scripture holdeth forth for Church Government.

SECT. II. CHAP. V.

What forme of Church Government ſeemes moſt conſonant to Scripture. *Whether* Monarchicall, Ariſtocraticall, *or* Democraticall.

IN this ſearch you will agree that the Government is fixed there, where you ſhall ſee ſetled the plenary and abſolute power of Election of Officers, Deciſion of controverſies, and Excommunication of thoſe that tranſgreſſe.

This you will finde miniſterially in the Officers, But *initiativè*, *virtualiter*, *& concluſivè*, originally, virtually, and concluſively, in the People.

The Officers are called Overſeers, Rulers, and Elders, &c.

Some of theſe are to preach and adminiſter the Sacraments, others to watch over mens manners, others to ſerve Tables, and look to the poor: All theſe are choſen by the People: but whenſoever by their induſtry any delinquency is diſcovered, the whole matter is brought to the Church, and there the People and Elders do paſſe their definitive ſentence.

Examine

Examine but where election of Officers, deciſion of controverſies and excommunication of members are recorded, and you ſhall have them all in the Church; not *repreſentative*, but in the whole Church, conſiſting of Officers and other members.

As firſt for *election*, *Act* 1.15. *Peter* ſpeaks to the People, and telleth them they muſt chuſe one in *Judas* his place, & *ver.* 23. It is ſaid *They* appointed Two. It is true the lot divided which of them two ſhould be the man, (a courſe in the like caſe not unlawfull to us at this day:) but the reducing of it to Two, was the act of the *Church*; though *Peter* was amongſt them. So afterwards *Timothy* received his Evangelicall gift by the Impoſition of Presbyteriall hands; which Presbyters were in this work, the ſervants of one preſent Congregation.

Secondly, Deciſion of Controverſies, either in Caſes of Conſcience, or in point of manners. In caſes of Conſcience; when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had no ſmall difference about Circumciſion, they ſent to Jeruſalem where the *Apoſtles*, *Elders*, and *brethren* meeting together, joyntly returned that anſwer which you finde *Acts* 15.23,24,25.

Some would preſſe this place, this act of the Apoſtles further, and give to every Synod a Commanding Power; becauſe it is ſaid *Act.* 15.28. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us, to lay no further burden upon you.* Therefore they ſay a Synod hath a commanding and burdening Power.

But I cannot conſent to that: for then the major part of the Churches in *Europe*, *Africa*, *Preſter Johns* Country, might meet and command all the Churches of Chriſt (which God forbid) in what they pleaſed; and that *jure divino*: for God when he giveth a rule to his Church, he ſpeaketh to the whole Church of Chriſt, and not to any particular Congregation. I only preſſe it thus far, That the *People* were joyned even with the *Apoſtles* in that Great Synod.

The commanding power of the Synod lay in this, that the Apoſtles ſpeak the mind of the Holy Ghoſt: But ſuch authority is not left in us; and therefore no ſuch Obligation upon others. Truly if there were ſuch a power left us, I ſhould with much ſcruple reſiſt any act of ſuch Government, whereof I could make a good conſtruction; For many times the power Commanding is more dangerous than the thing Commanded: but there is no ſuch power. Neither, as I ſaid before, do I preſſe it with ſuch a deſign.

In

In cases of Civill converse, *Mat.*18.17. We must make our addresses to the Church; and he that will not hear the Church must be as a Publican.

In that place the greatest dispute will be, What is meant by the Church? for some will say, Here is meant the Church *representative*; either in *more*, as the Presbytery, or in *one*, as the *Bishop*; and not the Church at large.

But I would labour to evince the contrary. Weigh either the Context, or the generall signification of the word *Church*, and I hope the true sense will be manifest.

For, Let us see how *Church* is taken in the Scripture: It is used sometimes *figurativè*; and sometimes *properly*. *Figurativè*, as when a particular house is called a *Church*; As, *the Church in his house*, Rom.16.5.

Secondly, When by *Synecdoche* the head is put for the whole; as Christ is called the *Church*, 1 *Cor.*12.12.

Thirdly, *Collectivè*, When all the Churches of Christ are called the *Church*, 1 *Cor.*10.32. It is used perhaps under some other figures, but it will be long to quote them all.

Secondly, It is used Properly in two phrases;

First, When the Congregation is called the Church; as the Church at *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, &c. Secondly, When the Congregations are called *Churches*; as the *Churches of Galatia*, and of *Judæa*. Thus it is used *Properly*, Thus *Figuratively*; but no where *representativè*: *scil.* the Ministers, the Presbyters, or the Bishops; or all these, for the Church. You shall find these and the Church contradistinct; as, *To the Saints, the Bishops, and the Deacons*, 1 *Phil.*1.1. *To the Church*, and *the Elders*, *Act.*15.4.

I conceive we are bound to take a word in that sense which is currant in Scripture; except that sense cleerly crosse the scope and drift of the text.

You shall meet with that word 48. times in the New Testament, and no where signifying that which we call the *Representative Church*: Very often for the Saints themselves: As, 1 *Cor.*1.*vers.*15. 2 *Cor.*1.*vers.*1. 1 *Thes.*1.*vers.*1 Why should we not then take it in the same sense? Are not we then bound to expound the word *Church* in some of those significations which are frequent in Scripture; and not in that sense, which

is so far from being found in the Text, that a Contradistinct phrase is, as I said before, rather used?

Againe, from the text, and context, That will appeare to be the meaning of the Spirit, and no other: The text is, *Mat. 18. ver. 17. If he shall neglect to heare them, tell the Church; but if he neglect to heare the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man, and a Publican.* The context is in the 15. and 16. verses. *If thy brother shall trespasse against thee, goe and tell him his fault betweene thee and him alone: If he shall heare thee, then hast thou gained thy brother; but if he will not heare thee, then take with thee one or two more; that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.*

In the context and the text there are three things to be examined, before the true sense can be found out: First, Who are meant in that *Gradation*, in the 15, 16, 17. *ver.* Secondly, Who is meant by *Thee. v.* 17. *Let him be to thee.* Thirdly, what is meant by *Publicans* and *sinners.*

First, Who is meant in that *Gradation.* In the first place is meant the Party; in the second part of the *Gradation*, where it is said, *Take with thee one or two more*; is meant the Elders, or the Bishops, the Officers of the Church.

If you say, they are not there understood: yet I am confident you wil not, I am sure you cannot, say they are there excluded. If then the Spirit pointed at them, with the other members of the *Church*, or *them solely*; it would be an unnecessary thing, to bring *him* afterwards to *them* againe, as to the *Representative* Church.

Secondly, by *Thee* (*v.* 17.) is not meant only the Party, but every Christian, every Church member, to whomsoever the newes of such a miscarriage shal come: else this wil be a means to nourish particular parties sidings, (which the Scripture doth exceedingly shun) If by Gods Law he should be a Publican to one of the Church and not to another: If he be so to every member of the Church, this will be a hard Case, that if a Bishop, or an Elder, one, two, or more, shall passe the bitter sentence of Excommunication, hee must bee so to mee also, though I know nothing of it.

But some will say, that must be done before the Church. To which I answer, The word saith no such matter. And thus those

those who mis-expound the Scripture, must eck out the Scripture, to make good their own imagination.

But secondly, why should it bee complained of before the Church, if the deciding power be in Officers? *Frustra fit per plura, quod fieri potest per pauciora*, It is in vaine to have that done by many, which may be done by a few.

But thirdly and lastly, if you will have the whole Church heare; it seemeth to me against all reason in the world, that the party deputed should have power, the party deputing being present. The Steward of a Court Leet, or Court Baron, is annihilated, if the Lord be there. All Officers vaile bonnet, when the party giving them power is present.

Why are Parliaments the representative body of the Kingdome, but because the Plough cannot stand? but because no place can containe the whole body? But if all the people could meet in *Campo Martio*, should those who now are but servants then be more than servants? surely the whole Church being present, foure or five by Gods Law shall not rule all, seeing Gods Law never appoints any standing Laws against the rules of nature.

In the third place we must enquire after the sense of *Heathen* and *Publican*: *sc.* the most odious of men. Is it possible that any Christian shall be to any Christian the most odious of men, for the sentence of a Judge which he never heard, neither hath right to heare?

Thus if you will be bound either by *text* or *context*, or the *common acceptation* of the word in the Scripture; by *Church* must be understood the whole congregation.

Againe, for excommunication of members, 1 *Cor.* 5.13. S. *Paul* commandeth them, (*sc.* the whole Church) to put away that wicked person, and to deliver up such a one to Satan. 2 *Cor.* 2. They restore him, they forgive him.

Thus we see every where, that in election of Officers, in decision of controversies, in cases of conscience, in Excommunication, the whole Church disposeth every thing, not the Bishops, not the Presbyters alone.

I doe not observe the Church hath power in other things, but in these, and in all these, in election of Officers, in decision of controversies, and excommunication of

delinquents, the whole power is in the Church.

I conceive then I have cleerely and briefly proved these three things:

1 That there is little in Scripture for Episcopacy; much lesse for such an Episcopacy as Ours.

2 Something against them.

3 Another Government cleerly delineated.

Sect. II. Chap. VI.

Of the consequents that may possibly follow the change of Church Government. Of the great danger of Schismes, Sects and Heresies. Of One new Sect *to come in the last dayes. Whether Bishops can keepe the Church from Schismes, Sects, &c. What is, or who are the* Cause *of most* Schismes *among st us.*

IT being (as I conceive it is) cleered both from *State-policy*, *Antiquity* and *Scripture*, how incompatible Civill Government and such Episcopacy are, I hope we shall never hereafter be choaked with that Proverebe, *No Bishop, no King*, I doe most willingly pay very great reverence to a saying deliverd to us by many successions, from the wisedome of our fore-fathers; But I shall ever crave leave to question that Maxime which may justly seeme to me the birth either of Ignorance, or Ends. *Antiquity* must have no more authority than what it can maintaine, by reason frequent impostures of this nature command us to be circumspect; did not our Predecessors hold the Torrid Zone *inhabitabilem æstu*, too hot to live in? till *Noahs* Dove, *Columbus* discovered Land, the World was confined in the Arke of *Europe*, *Africa*, and *Asia*.

In Divinity, where an error is of most dangerous consequence, we have beene too credulous: how many hundred yeares did our fore-fathers swallow this pleasant bait, *We must believe as the Church believeth?* And, since the light of Reformation, Was not particular assurance of our Salvation delivered us, as an exact definition of our faith?

Wee have ventured our bodies as well as our soules upon these sands; for in the Art of Phisicke (though our Parents at a very great remoteneſſe were wiser) it hath passed for a cur-

rant.

rant position that Phlebotomy almost in any case was more than dangerous. And that men might pay dear for their learning, they have been as wise in Tenets of State-Policy.

Have not too many great ones closed in with *Nero's* conclusion, *me oderint dum metuant*, Let them hate me so they fear me?

Lastly, Episcopacy hath been the basis, the superstructure, the All, the soul of Church Discipline for these many ages: but *dabit his meliora Deus*, God will deal better with us.

Some of these Tenets spring from invincible Ignorance; others have been the base pullulations of spirits enslaved to false ends: This, *No Bishop no King* (as I have fully proved) partakes of both; and therefore hath no weight with me, nor I hope shall ever hereafter be of credit with any body else; for we see that old received truthes are not alwayes to be entertained: and so I leave them with their maxime to the sentence of every judicious Reader.

There yet remaineth an objection or two, which must necessarily receive an answer, before I shut up this discourse. *Obj.* Allow there are some inconveniences, (yea great ones) in Episcopacie; yet *ex malis minimum*, of evils we must take the least it is better to bear these than groan under worse. If Episcopacy be taken away, *Schismes* and *Heresies* will break in as armed men; *Tyranny* is more eligible then *Anarchy*; the wofull sense of *Anarchy* begot that sad Proverb, *It is as it was with Israel, when there was no King.*

Ans. I do agree to this, that a confusion is a most lamentable condition; and that those times are very perillous, when every mans hand is up against his brother; *Ephraim* against *Manasses*, and *Manasses* against *Ephraim*: Yea, I do professe the distraction of *Heresies*, the most miserable of all. Civill conquassations disjoint the outward estate; but *Heresies* distract our souls, dismember our Churches, shave off Jew and Gentile, who know not whether part to beleeve, shake the weaker, cause heart-burning amongst the stronger, do exceedingly provoke God to wrath and displeasure. But first let us consider whether it be possible to be without Heresies

and Schisms. Secondly, whether Episcopacy be not the efficient cause of the most grievous Schisms, and Heresies. Thirdly, whether Those which may justly be feared upon the removall of Episcopacy, be of such dangerous consequence, as to weigh down the keeping up of that Government, rather than to hazzard what inconveniences may there-hence follow.

And first to the first of these.

It will be clear both from experience, and Scripture, and reason, that Heresies must come. Look over all Nations, and all times, and you shall finde them distracted with difference of opinions: How many severall Sects do you hear of amongst the Jews, and some of them extreme grosse? the Sadduces, the Pharisees, the Esseans, Herodians, with many more; though a great Critick reduce them to Three. Christ had no sooner committed the care of his Church to the Apostles, Disciples, and ordinary Ministers, but they were over-run with heresies: Yea, in their time, some were of *Paul*, some of *Apollo*, some of *Cephas*; in the interim *Christ* quite laid aside. In the Church of *Pergamus*, were there not some that held the Doctrine of the *Nicolaitans*? In *Thyatira* did not some of the Church listen to the Propheteſſe *Jezebel*, who taught them to commit fornication, and to eat things offered unto Idols? *Barnabas* and *Paul* were at some difference: the doctrine of works was pressed upon the *Galatians*, and the resurrection from the dead questioned by the *Corinthians*.

Amongst *Heathens* (where Morality was their God) had you not the *Peripateticks*, the *Scepticks*, the *Platonists*, the *Epicureans*, and many other *Sects*? The Pope and Papacy have been much turmoyled with Schisms; and these Schisms have produced great confusions amongst them.

In the yeer of the Lord 420. *Boniface* the eighth being chosen, the Clergy chose *Eulatius*, and there they decreed one another Hereticks; *Simmachus* and *Laurentius* caused the same distraction in the yeer 499. 760. Pope *Custantine* being convinced of Schisms and bereft of both his eyes, he and *Philip* (another Pope) were deposed, and *Stephen* elected in their places. Thus it was 958. 973. 995. 1047. 1058. 1062. 1083. 1100. 1118. 1124. in the yeer of the Lord 1130. the disputes

betwixt

betwixt *Gregory* and *Peter* (both chosen Popes) were so famous that it was grown a Proverb and recorded in this verse.

Petrus habet Romam, totam Gregorius orbem, *Peter* possessed Rome, and *Gregory* the rest of the world.

Every twenty years had such changes as these, even till of late, that Church hath been vehemently turmoyled with all their learned. Amongst the School-men, some are *Scotists*, some *Thomists*: among the *Polemiques*, some *Jesuites*, some *Dominicans*. And all these wrangle each with other.

In the yeer of our Lord 1400. there was a great dispute about the Originall sinne of the *Virgin Mary*. Between 1215. and 1294. was that great Faction between the *Guelfians* and *Gibelines* (though both were Papists) One defending the authority of the *Pope*, the other of the *Emperour*. In some points of Controversie, *Bellarmine* (one of their ablest Writers) is not to be read without restriction, and not without licence of Superiors.

If we survey all Antiquity, we shall finde no one Century free from *Hereticks*. *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, *Marcion*, *Samusatenus*, *Novatians*, *Sabellians*, *Nepotians*, *Maniches*, *Arrians*, *Pelagians*, with many others, have troubled the Church from time to time.

If you descend so low as our dayes, even among Protestants you shall meet with too too many Divisions. *Luther* and *Calvin*; and the English Church between both; a *Calvinist* for Doctrine, a *Lutheran* for Discipline. The *Lutherans* are divided in *Rigidiores*, & *Molliores*; the *More rigid*, and the *More Moderate*; and these differ *toto Cœlo*, as far as heaven and earth. The *Calvinists* have many disputes: How fiercely doth learned *Erastus* contend with *Calvin* and *Beza*, about *Excommunication*, denying the Church any such power?

The Church of *England* hath three maine Divisions: The *Conformist*, the *Non-Conformist*, and the *Separatist*. The *Conformist* hath the *Orthodox* Divine, contending with the *Arminian*, *Socinian*, *Pelagian*, *Anabaptist*, and divers others; who yet All stile themselves Sonnes of the Church of England. The *Non-conformist* is uncertaine what he scrupleth; for some can dispence with one of the three Grand Nocent-innocent Ceremonies;

monies; some with another; some with neither. The *Separatist* is subdivided too (as they say) into *Seperatist*, and *Semi-separatist*. Many other Divisions there also be, and will be, in Churches here.

Yea, it is clear in Reason, that Divisions, Sects, Schisms, and Heresies, must come; For, many are apt to advance themselves and undervalue all others: and Mens Brains being fertile of errors, after they have conceived they must bring forth; though the Gospel suffer never so much by it. And while This Temper is among men, you must still expect *Schismes* and *Heresies*.

The Scripture hath put this out of all doubt, it saith, *Heresies must come*. Christ came to set a Sword, not only betweene the Good and Bad, but even among Professors of the same Christian Religion; that Those who hold out to the End may have their Honour and Reward. It is to be marked that Christ doth not presse his people to seeke their freedome, till *Rome* be falling, and then he saith, *Come out of her my People*.

Yea, the Scripture foretelleth of one *Heresie* that is not yet (perhaps) come; it may be it is now in the Birth, sure it is not farre off: It is mentioned in the second of *Timothy*, the third Chapter, and some of the first verses.

1 *This know also, that in the last days perillous times shall come.*

2 *For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankefull, unholy.*

3 *Without naturall affection, truce-breakers, false-accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good.*

4 *Traitors, heady, high minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.*

5 *Having a forme of Godlinesse, but denying the power thereof: from such turne away.*

Expositors all agree This misery to be in the Waine: But in their agreement they differ very much; for some conceive the *Papist* is here understood; others apply it to the late Troublers of Israel, the *Arminian*, *Socinian*, and the worst sort of Episcopall men, that under the Notion of indifferent Ceremonies would have brought us to swallow down all *Popery*.

But

But under favour, I doubt neither of Theſe, reach the full meaning of the Text. It cannot be the *Papiſt*, becauſe it is not to riſe till the *Laſt Dayes*. Indeed *Popery* is cleerely expreſſed in the 1 of *Tim.* the fourth, verſe the 1, 2, 3. (as that moſt Learned and Reverend man Mr. *Mead* hath fully cleered in his moſt excellent piece on that Text) yet there it is ſaid to riſe in the Later Times (*viz.* of the Roman Empire;) but here theſe new Hereticks come not out till the *Laſt* (not only *Later*) *Dayes*, not only *Times*, but *Dayes* of thoſe *Times*.

Againe, it ſeemes not to be the *Arminian* (or any of that Rable I mentioned but now.) For firſt, the Character of their Times is Perillous, as if it would intimate men indeed ſhould be in danger, but yet eſcape, the Times being only perillous: But while Popery bore all before it, forced the whole Church into the Wilderneſſe, cloathed the Witneſſes with Sackcloth, and at laſt prevailes to kill them: ſure theſe Times are more than perillous. But perhaps there is no preſſing force in This.

In the ſecond place let us conſider the Character of the Perſons. Firſt, they are expreſſed as Breakers of the Lawes of *Civill Converſe*; and then as *Hypocrites* in *Religion:* the firſt of theſe beginneth at the ſecond, and continueth to the fifth verſe: The ſecond is in the fifth and ſixth verſes. Let us view ſome paſſages in both.

Lovers of themſelves, Covetous, Proud, &c. And have not men been ſuch ever ſince *Adam?* Why then doth the Spirit ſpeak of This, as a ſtrange thing in the *Laſt Dayes?* Mr. *Calvin* ſaw this Objection, and therefore oft affirmes (That the Scripture may not ſeeme to ſpeak *Frigidè*, unaptly. Here muſt be ſome new ſtrange Crew of Men that act all Theſe in a moſt eminent manner, even to the eye of all men.

But ſome will ſay, Are not the *Papiſts* ſo? Is not the corrupter part of *Prelates* ſuch? Are not the *Arminians* of this temper? Certainely they are ſuch, and in an eminent manner: and yet to me they ſeeme not the men the Spirit pointeth at in this place.

The maine Thing in which theſe men (here expreſt) pride

themſelves, is not Learning, or Parts; But (if I be not much miſtaken) ſomewhat beyond and within all theſe: That, I ſuppoſe, which ſeemes to them to be the Spirit. This, I conceive, is the *Baſis* of all their vanity, pride, and inſolence. They have the Spirit, and ſo know more than all the Learned, Pious, Godly Men in the world. They have the Spirit, they cannot ſinne, they cannot erre; they will not pray, but when that Spirit moves. *Adultery* is but an act of the Fleſh, but they are all Spirit, and no Fleſh. What ſhould theſe men doe with Naturall affections, they are all Spirit? in this caſe if they bee Traytors, High-minded, Heady, &c. Who will wonder? What may they not bee carried up to, by the imagination of the Spirit? But let them take heed, if they have any thing of God in them; let them be wiſe in this their day, for the time may come when it will bee too late. In the meane time I will ſay as *Peter* did to *Simon*, *Pray* (that if it be poſſible) *this wickedneſſe of heart may bee forgiven.*

If we look on the other part of their Character, *Having a forme of Godlineſſe, but denying the Power thereof, Creeping into the houſes of ſilly women, Laden with divers Luſts*, &c.

How can theſe be ſpoken of *Arminians*, *Socinians*, or our Prelates? It were to bee wiſhed that moſt of Theſe had ſo much as a *Forme* of Godlineſſe. Sure the World is now growne too wiſe to take Duckings, and Cringings, Croſſing, and Crouching, with all of this kinde, to be ſo much as a *Forme* of Godlineſſe.

Doe Theſe creep into Womens houſes? the *Socinians*, and *Arminians* attempt no ſuch pranks, that I know of. And the Patrons of Epiſcopacy uſe not much perſwaſion, but Club law: All elſe is in Corners.

It ſeemes very probable to me, that the Holy Ghoſt in This text points out ſome ſuch, as the *Family of Love*, the *Antinomians*, and *Grindletonians* are, if (at leaſt) they are not much belyed. And to theſe, I think, every piece of This Character will moſt properly belong. Yea, and the Cloſe of it alſo, or the Iſſue of That Sect. *They ſhall proceed no farther, for their folly ſhall bee made manifeſt to all men*, which can hardly

hardly bee understood either of *Arminianisme*, or *Prelacy*, since *That* in severall names, *This* in severall dresses, hath been in the world above 1000. years.

Thus you see *Sects*, *Schismes*, and *Heresies* will still come, and must come: And therefore if by keeping such Bishops we think to keep out all Divisions, we are much deceived. Which yet I speak not to take away watchfulnesse in Church-Governours, (who are still bound to suppresse Divisions as much as they can) but to convince men of This (if I can) that *Episcopacy* is never like to prevent Schismes: which I hope to cleere more fully in my subsequent discourse

I could never conceive more than Two wayes, that in probability may bee like to quiet us in respect of Divisions. One of These we have no minde to try, and the other we may not if we would.

The Spaniard indeed by his cruell *Inquisition*, hath inclined his Subjects to a kinde of *Vnity*; but an Unity of Darknesse and Ignorance: so that the Remedy proves worse than the Disease. Neither will, or can Tyranny either Civill, or Ecclesiastick, bring forth better fruit.

The other *Way* is That of the *Vnited Provinces* (in the Low Countreyes) who let every *Church* please her selfe in her owne way, so long as she leaveth the *State* to her selfe. And how Religion doth flourish There, is known to most men. I will not dispute This now; only I wish heartily, men would remember, that even *Nature* her selfe as much abhors a *forced violent Vnion*, as a *Rent* or *Division*.

But in the next place, let us seriously consider, whether the Bishops (as now they bee setled here) be not the Cause of most Sects, Schismes, and Heresies now amongst us.

Some of them will not deny themselves to be *Arminians*; and others cannot deny themselves *Socinians*. If at least they think we can understand their writings, printings, yea and Sermons, though These be very Rare.

Yea some doe not deny, but they may (at least) receive Orders from *Rome*; they meane a Pale, Mitre, and Cardinalls Hat, if they come. All which we may yet better construe

by their carriage to Priests and Jesuites, both in publique and private, which now we know more than by bare surmise. Many of these they countenance openly, and never question any, though it bee certainely knowne: wee had (they had) more such in London, than were good Ministers in all England almost.

All the Livings under most of our Bishops have been committed to the cure and care of superstitious Formalists, Arminians, Socinians, Papists, or Atheists. Yea, the Universities are much corrupted by their malignant influence; for *Nero*-like they think they have done nothing, till they have murdered their owne Mother. In a word, through the whole Kingdome, Preaching, Praying, Expounding, and the like exercises, both in publick & private, are severely suppressed, and in many places altogether forbidden (except such and such, more pernicious than profitable;) and al this by the Fathers of our Church, the Lords our Bishops. And is not this the most compendious way possible to beget and encrease *Heresies*?

They cry out of Schisme, Schisme, Sects and Schismes; and well they may: They make them, and it is strange they should not know them. When they laid such stumbling blocks (Reall Scandals, not only *accepta*, but *data*, not taken, but given,) in the way of good men, whose Consciences they have grievously burdened, and wounded with things (violently pressed on the greatest fines) that are so far from being indifferent, that many of them were point blank unlawfull: have they not by this even forced their brethren to separate themselves in Judgement and Practice, till they could finde some remote place that might separate their bodies also? Was not this in them the readiest way to produce Divisions, Separations, and (as they call it) *Schismes* in the Church? Rents are bad, I confesse, where ever they be violent; but yet then worst, when most out of the eye. *Schismes* in the *Conscience* are of greatest danger; and to prevent these, if I am forct to that, which they please to call a *Schisme* in the Church, Woe to him that so forceth me. Scandals, Schismes, and Divisions must come; but woe to him by whom they come. God forgive them in this particular.

I pro-

I professe I take no pleasure in ripping up their foule, loathsome sores; I would they could bee throughly healed without launcing and opening. I could give you a strange account of sad Divisions, which themselves have caused both to *Church* and *State*: I could tire you and my selfe in this, though I should begin but little higher than mine own time, mine own Knowledge.

In Queene *Elizabeths* time, many good men were cut off from the *Church*, some from the *State*; a sad Schisme! Some by violence laid asleep; Many suspended, silenced, deprived, cut off (by a strange Schisme,) from liberty, livings, (that I goe not higher;) And all this for one word, of their owne compounding, *Non-Conformity*: While they themselves are indeed the greatest *Non-Conformists* to all the *Reformed Churches* in *Europe*.

Surely, it would have savoured more of Humility, of Christianity, if they had suspected their owne Judgements and Opinions; allowing something to the Judgement, Learning, and Piety of those holy, worthy, pretious Saints, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Bucer*, *P. Martyr*, *Oecolampadius*, *Zuinglius*, with many more, great, famous, and eminent Lights, in their times.

If they will stand for *Conformity*; Let any man living judge, whether it be fitter for some few Bishops, newly come out of grosse Popery, (and still retaining their old Popish Ceremonies,) to *reforme*, and *conforme* themselves to the Judgement and Practice of all *Reformed Churches*; or all Churches to subscribe to them.

As they began, so they continued: Christ and they being like *parallell* lines, though they should run out *in infinitum*, they would never meet: Nay rather, like the *Crura* of a *Triangle*, the farther they run (out from the *Center*) the more they differ, and are distant each from other.

Under King *James*, in a few yeares, foure or five hundred Reverend men were divided from their Livings, and Ministery: And was not this a cruell Schisme? Now also by Them was first forged that sharpe *Rasor*, (or, *Book of Sports*) with which they have since made great *Divisions* of *heart*.

But in our Gracious Kings Reigne, they have come to

Cutting off Eares, Cheeks; and have yet ſtruck deeper, and eſſay'd many *Soule-Schiſmes*; not only in the Hearts and Conſciences of thouſands of good men; but whole States alſo and Kingdomes, as much as in them lay.

While I heare the ſad groanes, and ſee the bleeding wounds of Three Kingdomes at once, by their Schiſmes; I have almoſt forgotten the parting ſighs, and farewell teares of ten thouſand poore Chriſtians, by Their Tyranny forc'd to abandon their native Country, and deareſt acquaintance; while others were here violently detained in Fetters, ſome ſmoothered in Dungeons, ſome Diſmembred, ſome driven out of houſe and Living, and forced to beg: All which yet would have bin born patiently, had not only all good men, but Goodnes it ſelfe, Learning, Religion, Piety, all that ſpeaks any worth, bin altogether, not only diſcountenanced, but ſuppreſſed, ſmoothered, and by moſt exquiſite Tortures almoſt forced to breath its laſt.

Yet that theſe Glorious Princes (under whom ſuch Tyrannies have beene committed) may not ſuffer in your thoughts, Give me leave to ſpeake ſome things on mine owne knowledge and experience, others from beſt intelligence. Queene *Elizabeth*, when ſhe heard of Their miſcarriages, fell on Them in moſt ſharpe language, threatning Them, if they ſhould ever doe the like againe to her Subjects.

King *James* offered faire diſcourſe to the *Non-Conformiſts*; honoured Mr. *Cartwright* and others of them; diſclaimed the Book of Sports: And being asked, why he made ſo many Bad Biſhops, anſwered ingenuouſly, with a ſtrong aſſeveration, *That hee was very ſorry, but could not helpe it; For, no good men would take the Office on them.* And our Gracious Soveraigne (ſince ſome light dawned out of darkneſſe,) hath delivered our Sifter Church of *Scotland* from that unhappy Generation.

For, now I hope the Clouds begin to breake away; Light ſpringeth up, while Dark Iniquity is forced not only to ſhut her mouth, but hide her ſelfe and diſappeare. Now the Sun againe mounteth up in our *Horizon*, and quickeneth the drooping ſpirits; ſo that many that were Bed-rid ſome moneths ſince, now begin to take up their Beds and walke, leaping up and bleſſing God.

Fire

Fire and *Water* may be restrained, but *Light* cannot; it will in at every cranny, and the more it is opposed, it shines the brighter: so that now to stint it, is to resist an *enlightned, enflamed Multitude*; which still was, and still will be *Durissima Provincia*, an hard taske.

Their mad outrage in all the three Kingdomes, of late, hath so incensed the common People, that in all mens eyes they are become most vile: and while all men reflect on their constant trade of mischeivous practices, the wisest begin to conclude, The very Calling hurts the Men, as much as these disgrace the Calling.

Thus we have by too too long, great, and sad experience, found it true, That our Prelates have been so far from preventing Divisions; that they have been the Parents and Patrons of most Errors, Heresies, Sects and Schismes, that now disturbe this Church and State.

Sect. II. Chap. VII.

The danger of Schismes *and* Sects *more fully discussed: the Nature and Danger of* Anabaptisme, Separatisme, *and* Unlicensed Preaching. *The conclusion with an affectionate desire of Peace and Union.*

But it may be, the *Remedy* will be worse than this *Disease*. Let us therefore, yet more exactly weigh all the Inconveniences that may attend the Change of this Church-Government, which we now dispute.

The Dangers which some have fancied may hence accrew to the State, have beene discussed in the former Section, to which more properly they doe belong. We have here only to consider such Evills as may have bad influence into the Church, and Polity thereof.

Arminianisme, Socinianisme, Superstition, Idolatry, Popery, will pack away with them; being their Attendants, as was shewed before. What is there then to be feared? *Anabaptisme, Brownisme, Separatisme*; may every body, every Lay-man will turne Preacher.

Suppose all this bee true, (which can bee but supposed;) Would

Would it not be much better to hazzard the comming in of all these, than still to suffer our souls and bodies to be grownd to powder by these Tyrannicall, Antichristian Prelates, that under pretence of keeping out *Separatisme*, introduce down-right *Popery*, and a sink of almost all Errors and Heresies? Yea, and these Errors of the Right Hand (which these pretend so much to oppose) owe their birth to our Bishops also; as was but now, and might yet more fully be cleered. We all know, that within these ten years, all the *Non-conformists* in England, could not amount to more then one or two hundred: And now how many thousands there be, (yea of such that rise one pin higher then Old *Non-conformity*,) Themselves, perhaps, know much better then I: Yet our Bishops never were more active then in all this time. Whence then ariseth this New *Non-conformity*, or *Separatisme*, but out of our Bishops commotions? I will not say as the Fathers did of old, *Ex martyrum sanguine pullulat Ecclesia*, the Church doth spring out of the *blood* of the Martyrs: yet I must confesse, I begin to think there may be perhaps somewhat more of God in these (which they call new *Schisms*) then appears at first glympse.

I will not, I cannot, take on me to defend That, men usually call *Anabaptism*: Yet I conceive that Sect is Twofold: Some of them hold *Free-will*; *Community* of all things; deny *Magistracy*; and refuse to *Baptize* their Children. These truly are such *Heretickes* (or Atheists,) that I question whether any Divine should honour them so much as to dispute with them; much rather sure should *Alexanders* sword determine here, as of old at the Gordian knot, where it acquired this Motto, *Quæ solvere non possum, dissecabo*, What I cannot *unty*, I will *cut* asunder.

There is another sort of them, who only deny *Baptisme* to their Children, till they come to yeares of discretion, and then they *baptize* them; but in other things they agree with the Church of England.

Truly, These men are much to be pitied; And I could heartily wish, That before they be stigmatiz'd with that opprobrious brand of *Schismatick*, the Truth might be cleered to them. For I conceive, to Those that hold we may goe no farther than

Scripture,

Scripture, for Doctrine or Discipline, it may be very easie to erre in this Point now in hand; since the Scripture seems not to have cleerly determined This particular.

The Analogy which *Baptisme* now hath with *Circumcision* in the old Law, is a fine Rhetoricall Argument, to illustrate a Point well proved before; but I somewhat doubt, whether it be proof enough, for that which some would prove by it: since (beside the vast difference in the Ordinances,) the persons to be Circumcised are stated by a positive Law, so expresse, that it leaves no place for scruple: but it is far otherwise in *Baptism*; Where all the designation of Persons fit to be partakers, for ought I know, is only, *Such as beleeve*. For this is the qualification that, with exactest search, I find the Scripture requires in persons to be *baptized*: And *This* it seems to require in All such persons. Now, how Infants can be properly said to *beleeve*, I am not yet fully resolved.

Yet many things prevaile very much with me in this point.

First, For ought I could ever learne, It was the constant custome of the purest and most Primitive Church, to baptize *Infants* of beleeving Parents; For I could never find the beginning and first Rise of this practice: Whereas it is very easie to track Heresies to their first Rising up, and letting foot in the Church.

Again, I find all Churches (even the most strict) have generally been of this judgment and practice: yea though there have been in all ages some, that much affected novelty, and had parts enough to discusse and cleer what they thought good to preach; yet was this scarce ever questioned by men of Note, till within these Last Ages. And sure, the constant judgment of the Churches of Christ, is much to be honoured, and heard in all things that contradict not Scripture.

Nor can I well cleer that of S. *Paul* (1 *Cor.*7.14.) *Else were your Children Uncleane, but now are they Holy*. I know some interpret it thus, *If it be unlawfull for a beleever to live in wedlock with one that beleeveth not; Then have many of you lived a long time in unlawfull marriage; and so your very Children must be Illegitimate, and These also must be cast off (as Base-born:) But it is not so; for, Your Children are Holy*; that is, *Legitimate*.

I confesse, This seems a very fair Interpretation; yet I much

queſtion, Whether This be all the Apoſtle means by that phraſe *Holy*; eſpecially when I reflect on the preceding words, *The Unbeleever is Sanctified by the Beleever*. Nor yet can I beleeve any *Inherent Holineſſe* is here meant; but rather That *Relative Church-Holineſſe*, which makes a man capable of admiſſion to *Holy Ordinances*, and ſo to *Baptiſm*: yea and to the *Lords Supper* alſo, for ought I ſee; except perhaps Infants be excluded from This Sacrament, by that text, *Let him that eateth, Examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat*. As *Women* are excluded from Church-government & Preaching in Congregations, by That of the ſame Apoſtle, *I permit not a Woman to ſpeak*; *Let Women keep ſilence*.

The ſecond thing we feare ſo much, is *Separation*, or as ſome tearm it *Browniſme*; for I am not ſo well ſtudied in theſe, as to give an exact difference betweene them, or properly to ſtate or phraſe either. Yet I think This alſo hath Latitude, and admits of difference. Before you paſſe any ſevere cenſure, be pleaſed to Hear theſe Poor men (you call *Separatiſts*;) Know their Tenets, and then Judge.

Their main Tenets (for ought I could ever learn) are about ſome few Points in *Diſcipline*, in which ſure there is leſſe danger, than in *Doctrine*, of which they diſpute not.

Firſt, they would admit none as members of their Aſſemblies, generally to partake with them in all the Ordinances, but ſuch which ſeem *Beleeving Saints*, and ſo members of Chriſts true Church.

Secondly, they conceive every ſeverall congregation (rightly conſtituted) hath within it ſelf *the power of the keyes*, committed to it, without dependence on other Churches: Yet not denying the lawfull aſſociation of ſeverall Churches, nor refuſing the advice and counſell of Councels and Synods.

I ſhall crave leave to ſcan the firſt, & ſee how much it differeth in truth, from the received tenets of the Church of *England*.

I do conceive that *England*, *Scotland*, *France*, all Churches, even *Rome* it ſelf will agree in this, that a Church is *Cœtus Fidelium*, *A Company of Beleevers, Gathered together in the Name and power of Chriſt, to wait on him, in the way of his Ordinances revealed in his Word*. In this I ſuppoſe we all agree; where then

then is that *Chasma*, that great Gulf of difference, which brands so many with the black spot of *Separation*?

All the difficulty lies in Stating who are beleeving Faithfull Saints, for of these onely all agree, a true Church consists. I beseech you let us call him a Beleever, and a Saint, whom the Scripture calls so, and we shall soon agree.

The Pope saith, he is a faithfull Saint, and a true Member of the Church; *Who beleeveth as the Church beleeveth.*

The Church of *England* saith, he is a Beleever (enough to make a Member of that Church,) that *professeth the truth*, though in his life he deny it.

Those men say he is a faithful Saint who *professeth the truth*, and to all appearance (for we cannot see the heart) practiseth as he professeth.

Now all men will agree, this last is a Beleeving Saint: And these will have none but this to be a Saint; and so none but this to be a Member of Christs Church.

I beseech you, is this such an error, to desire *Profession* and *Practice* to be conjoyned in one that is to be a Member of the Church of Christ?

When I desire a good Wife, a faithfull Servant, a constant Friend, a familiar companion; am I not as desirous to know the Heart as well as the Head, the will as well as Skill, Affection as well as Profession? And why then may I not do as much in chooſing my Spirituall Friends; my constant companions in the worship and service of God?

Can any man by right, force me to marry such or such a woman, to take such a servant, to dwell with such a friend, to choose such a companion? And may any man force me then to be companion, in the neerest and most intimate converse of Spirituall Ordinances, with any one or more whom I dare not, I cannot, I may not trust, to be either friends to God or me, because what ere their lips professe, their life and wayes deny God, trample on the blood of Christ, despise, at least profane all his Ordinances.

I could heartily wish some pity might be shewed to these poor mens souls. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to his own Soul.* And is it not then

much better to keep theſe men off (as they do in *Scotland* and other Reformed Churches) till they give the Church ſatisfaction upon good ground of their Repentance and Faith; that ſo they may not hurt themſelves by Gods holy Ordinances?

Sacraments confirm, but do not conferre Grace; if they did ſo, the caſe were altered; but now they are like the Paradiſe of God, guarded with the *Flaming Sword*; ſo that the Tree in the midſt of the Garden, (which is Chriſt) cannot be Touched by prophane hands.

The other Grand Hereſie (men ſo much cry againſt) in *Separation*, is the *Independence* of their Congregations, as it was ſtated before.

But why ſhould the *Independence* of One aſſembly, to a *Province*, or *Nation*, be more *Schiſmaticall*, then that of a *Province*, or *Nation*, to the whole *World*? Why may not *Geneva* be as *Independent* to *France*, as *France* may be to the other parts of *Europes* Continent? In *Geneva*, why may not one Congregation, be as independent to all *Geneva* beſides, as *Geneva* is to all *France* beſides? Doth indeed ſuch a Wall, or River, or Sea, ſo limit and bound the Church within it, that it may be independent on any Church without it; and may not one Congregation within this River be as well independent on all other Aſſemblies within the ſame River or Sea?

Are there not ſome ſparklings of this Truth, even amongſt us in *England*? Have not we *Peculiars*? ſome Congregations exempt from the Juriſdiction of the Biſhop within whoſe Dioceſſe they be? And I think no Separatiſt deſireth more than this, That all Pariſhes (I mean all Congregations) ſhould be *Independent Peculiars*.

Suppoſe an Eaſt-Indi-Merchants Ship be caſt on ſome remote Iland beyond *China* where there ſhall be no Inhabitant; may not in this Caſe, the men of this Ship gather together, chooſe out ſome one or more (of themſelves) to Read, Preach, Adminiſter the Sacraments? is not this a true Church, and ſo to be reputed while they beleeve the Truth, and do what they beleeve? Is there any one Eſſentiall part wanting to this Church, ſo Conſtituted?

If

If it be answered affirmatively, that there is yet wanting some Essentiall; I rejoyn, then it is not a true Church; nay so far from being *vera Ecclesia*, a true Church, that it is not *verè Ecclesia*, truly a Church: For He is not *verè Homo*, truly a Man, that wants something *Essentiall* to Man: nor is it *verè Ecclesia*, truly a Church, that wants any thing *Essentiall* to a *Church*.

If it be yeelded that in such a case there is nothing Essentiall wanting to This Church: I will again suppose that within a year or Two, another English Ship be cast on the same very Iland, and have such another Company or Church; I demand now whether it be necessary, that Both These Churches must needs joyn together, or at least depend One on the Other.

If it be *not necessary*, I have what I desire. If it be *necessary*, Then was not the former Church a *True Church*; because it wanted something *Essentiall* and *Necessary* to a *Church*; to wit, *Dependence* on some other Church.

If it be said, This Church did before depend on the whole *Catholike Church*, I will not gainsay it; so They mean only Thus much, that *This Church was a true member of the True Church or Body of Christ*; which is but made up of so many particular Congregations, as mans body of its particular members. And so This will be no more than to say, All the members of the Body are Parts of the Body, and *conjoyned* together, but onely *subordinate* to the Head. For, I suppose no man will say One of my *hands* is dependent on the Other; but both (as all the other members) dependent on my *Head*: so are all particular Churches (I mean Congregations) dependent on their Generall Head, *Christ*, but not on other of their fellow members.

If any man shall say, that *Hands* depend not onely on the *Head*, but also on the *Arms*, *Shoulders*, and *Neck*, which are between Them & the *Head*, on whom they ultimately depend.

I answer, It is true, the *Hands* are *conjoyned* to the *Arms*; These to the *Shoulders*; and Both by the *Neck* to the *Head*: but yet They *depend* not on any but the *Head*. I mean they are not directed and guided by the Dictates of *Arm*, *Shoulder*, or *Neck*, but only by the commands of the *Head*: so that there is only a bodily outward Continuity, and no virtuall *Dependence*, but on the *Head*. The *Head* sends out *Animall Spirits*,

and by them guides my *Hand*, as my fancie pleaseth. This Guiding or Directing *Depends* onely on the *Head*, not *Arm*, which (when I mean to move my *Hand*) is but as it were my *Hands Servant*, that must go and call, and lead my *Hand* (as a Gentleman-Usher) but not command it.

So are also all the Churches, all severall congregations; They are all members, and are all outwardly conjoyned One to another (through all the world) by the *tendons* and *ligaments* of Rivers, Seas, Hils, Vallies, and the like. Yea and some of These are neerer to Christ their Head, as they keep themselves purer, and walk more closely in dependence on Him. Yet All these Churches are but *coordinate*, not among themselves *subordinate*. They are but conjoyned each to other, not dependent each on other, but All on their Head; which alone can command and move them. Yea though perhaps some One Church may come between Christ and another Church (as the Arm between the Head and Hand) yet it is there but as a servant to call on, lead, help, uphold, (being so commanded by the Head) but not to command, dictate, or over-top its fellow-members.

You see here what Power we give to Synods and Councels, or all other Churches over one particular Church; to wit, a counselling, perswading (which sure is very prevailing) but not commanding Authority.

I doubt not but Christ doth sometimes require one Church to incite, exhort, admonish, and perswade another fellow-Church (though This be not required of any one Angel in the Apocalyps, towards another Church or Angel, yet I suppose it may be in some cases) yea and so that the Other Church may haply sin if she do not follow this *call* and *counsell*: yet not because it comes from her fellow-Church, (or any Synod) but because it comes from Christ her Head, that speaks through This Church to her fellow. As the Hand might justly be stiled rebellious that rejects the Animall Spirits sent from the Head, though they come *through* the Arm; Which is here in this case, not only a servant to the *Head*, but to the *Hand* also.

Yet doth not the *Hand* rebell, because it refuseth that which comes from the *Arm*, but because it came from the *Head*, but through

through the *Arme* as an Instrument. For if ever the *Arme* impose ought on the *Hand*, which comes not from the *Head* (as it doth sometimes in a flux of putrid humours from an ulcer in the *Arme*) in this case the *Arme* erres in so imposing on the *Hand*, but the *Hand* rebels not in rejecting what the *Arme* so sends: because it comes not from the *Head*. On which (and on which alone) all the members virtually *depend*, and not on any one or more fellow-members.

All this while, though we dispute the Independency of Churches among themselves; yet we have not the least shadow of a Thought to withdraw any Church from the *civill Magistrate*; Nay, These men (whom our Bishops brand so with Separation) most cordially affirme that if *Episcopacy* can prove greater or better *subjection*, or but equall to Them, They will not scruple to subscribe to Them.

But alas, if we once give way to *Dependence* of *Churches*, must not the Church of *England* Depend on the *Dutch*, or the *Dutch* on *English*; as much as one Church in *England* must Depend on a *Provinciall* Church of *Canterbury*, or *Nationall* in all *England*?

And if the English Church must Depend on the *Dutch*, or *Dutch* on *English*; which shall be *Inferior*? This, or That? by This Dispute of *Precedency*, wee shall at length cast all Churches into such a confusion, as some of our Bishops Sees were heretofore, for superiority. *Pompeius non admittit superiorem, Cæsar non parem*, *Pompey* could not endure a superior, nor *Cæsar* an equall. And now I conceive *York* is inferior to *Canterbury*, *Durham* to *York*, not by any Law Morall, or of Nature, but positive of State.

Yea, by This *Dependence*, will follow a farre greater Evill than This dispute and confusion about *Precedency*: For if One whole Church must so depend on another, then must also the Officers of This depend on Those of That Church; And if so, shall not all Church-Officers returne to the Pope at length, as to One Supreme Head on Earth?

If *Geneva* depend on *France*, why not *France* on *Spain*? *Spain* on *Italy*? *Italy* on *Rome*? *Rome* on the Pope? And had I begun a great deal lower, I should have come up higher to this Head.

Perhaps,

Perhaps all the *Inconveniences* that can be objected on *Independence*, though they could not be answered (as I conceive they may) will not ballance this one inconvenience of *Dependence*. But no more of this.

The next Grand Inconvenience that may be feared on the removall of our Prelates is, *Licentia prædicandi*, A liberty of Preaching, not onely in that sense in which this phrase is used beyond the Seas, and was in that sense forbidden under our last Royall King *James*: That was *Licentia quoad Materiam*, A liberty in regard of the subject matter; This *quoad Personam*, in regard of the Person.

Now they say, not onely every *matter* will be preached, what every Minister pleaseth, but also every *Person* will turn *Preacher*: Even Shoomakers, Coblers, Feltmakers, and any other.

God is the God of Order, and not of Confusion. And if Order is to be observed any where, it is sure in matter of *Worship*: For if through the Churches default Disorder breake in, at any craney, you shall finde the Breach grow wider and wider every day: Except the Cleft be stopt, the Ship may quickly sinke. And therefore I shall wholly agree, and joyne with them that endeavour with the first, to allay the very semblance and apparition (lesse than the least bubling up) of *Disorder*.

Onely this I could heartily wish, that Fire and Fagot may not determine this Controversie; that these men may not bee dealt with, as here some of the Martyrs in Queene *Maries* daies; for oft when the Bishops could not reply, they would start up and sweare by the *Faith of their Body*, that this was a dangerous, grosse, & Heretical opinion; And all this was but a Prologue to that Tragedy, whose Epilogue was Flame and Fagot; or at least the *Fasces*, a bundle of rods, to younger men.

We have oft seene some of these Preachers before the highest Tribunall in this Kingdome; For we thought it unreasonable (with those in the *Acts*) to condemne any before they were heard.

I was not their Judge alone, nor will I be at this time.

Onely

Only that it may appeare I attended their pleading (as it becomes any in a Court of Justice) I will give the world an account, what Those men say for themselves; and so I shall leave them to be judged by wise men.

First, they conceive there be some Ordinances which are proper only to the *Church*, and *Church-Officers*, belonging only to Church Assemblies (such as is the Administration of Sacraments, the Conferring of Orders, and all of this nature) These they think *Sacred*, such as may not be touched by any but Church-Officers; and of These they say, let *Uzzah* take heed how he touch the *Ark*, though it shake.

But there are other Ordinances (they say) of a Middle nature; as they are exercised in a Church Assembly, by Church-Officers, They may truly be called *Church-Ordinances*; yet are such as may be used Out of Church Assemblies, and therefore probably by Other than Church-Officers, As Praying, Reading the Scripture, Cathechising, Exhortation, and the like; which (as they conceive) are not confined to the *Church* only, or *Church Officers*.

1. Because Heathens and Publicans may be admitted, nay ought to be invited, to These *Ordinances*. And it seemes no Mortall sinne, for a Lay-man in *China*, to call together a company of Heathens, and preach to them the Christian Religion, yet here is no True Church, till a Congregation will Embrace This Doctrine, and joyne in serving God.

2. They conceive Our State, by publick authority, hath and doth allow so much as This. For they see Clerks (even in publick Assemblies) Read Psalmes, Prayers, and oft some parts of Scripture; Deacons preach, yea and Baptize, and help to administer the Lords Supper; and yet no man takes them for compleat Ministers: yea of old, and perhaps now also by Law, they are not at all Clergy men.

3. Former Preachers have taught them, that every Master of a Family, may and must read, pray, catechise, and the like, in his owne Family, if hee have none there that can doe it better than himselfe. Therefore These seeme rather to come under the Notion of Private Duties rather than Publike Church-Ordinances; though

sometime they be performed in Churches, yet other times they may be performed out of Churches, and by those that are not publike Church Officers.

Therefore these poore men (through their weakneſſe) think ſuch Ordinances free to be performed by any Chriſtian, whether of the Clergy, or Laity. And their zeale makes them conceive, if God give gifts of Underſtanding, Memory, Judgement, and Utterance, and an Earneſt Deſire to doe good with theſe (leſt they wrap up their Talent in a Napkin) They have the Maine (to wit, an inward) Call to performe theſe duties in their owne Families: or elſewhere, if they have an outward Call too.

For they ſolemnly profeſſe, they hold it not fit to preſſe or intrude themſelves on any Congregation: But if any will come of themſelves, either to their owne Families, or ſend for them, and deſire to heare them, among ſome good men, they take this for a call, an outward call, to performe thoſe duties, to that Congregation. For, they thinke the wayes of Gods Spirit are free, and not tied to a Univerſity man; ſo that having an inward call, they conceive the deſire of any one Congregation, is outward call ſufficient, though the Biſhop call not.

Yea, ſome Exerciſes in Gods Worſhip, they thinke there be, which are warranted from the Gift that enables, and not from the Call that invites: ſo that a man whom God hath enabled with Parts and Gifts, might uſe them, though no man Living call him. And this alſo is the Judgement of many Learned men; as of That Ingenuous, Worthy, Learned man Maſter *Thorndicke*, of late Touching on That of the *Corinths*.

So long then as they Encroach not on Ordinances appropriate to *Church-Officers*, they thinke they ſinne not in performing other duties, where there are none that can, or will performe them better. They have learned Latine Enough to ſay, *Bonum quò communius, eò melius*, What is Good, is made better by the commonneſſe. They have read of *Moſes*, wiſhing all the Lords People were Prophets; and that God would poure out his Spirit on them all.

Yea,

Yea, they have heard that God promised to poure out his Spirit upon all Flesh, all Beleevers (as well Lay as Clergy) so that Young men should see Visions, and Old men dreame Dreames, and though this were begun to be accomplished even in our Saviours time, yet they (perhaps through ignorance) Expect it should be yet still more and more accomplished every day, till Knowledge cover the Earth, as Waters fill the Sea; even till there be no more need that any man should teach his neighbour, for all men shall know the Lord; and they poore men expect a new Heaven, and a new Earth, wherein there shall need no more Temples of stone, but all good men shall be Prophets, Priests, and Kings. In the meane time they say Waters must flow out of the bellies of all that believe, till at length the great Waters of the Sanctuary flow forth without measure.

Yea, they are much encouraged from the Practise of the Church in the *Acts*, where all the members, Every beleever, being scattered by persecution, went about Preaching. Acts 8.4. 11.19.

If it be Objected that this was an Extraordinary Case; at the first beginning of the Church, and in time of Persecution, &c.

They Answer, that they conceive almost as Extraordinary case in This Land, at This Time; Where the Church is so much unsetled, and hath been so much persecuted. In some places they see no Ministers; scarce any in some whole Shires; as in *Cumberland*, *Westmorland*, *Northumberland*, and especially in *Wales*: Where the Church is even yet scarce (*& ne vix*) so much as well begunne to be planted, or the Gospell Preached.

In other places, where there is some shew of a *Church*, some Ordinances, some *Ministers*; yet even here, they thinke the Church calleth for many more Ministers, at least for much more, and much better preaching than it yet hath.

Specially since the late cruell Tyranny of some Lording Prelates, hath almost quite put downe Ordinances, silenced Good Ministers, and forbidden Preaching; Having so detained the Truth (and smothered it) by unrighteousnesse, that there is scarce left the Face of a true Church. They con-

ceive this an extraordinary time, an extraordinary Caſe, and Call, for all that are enabled by God, with Parts and Gifts, fit for ſuch exerciſes.

And they conceive 30, or 40, or an 100. Good men of any one or more congregations, to be as Fit Judges of their parts and abilities every way, as One Lord Biſhop and his ignorant (perhaps Drunken) Chaplain; who makes ſcruple of admitting any to Orders, but Bowers and Cringers, ſinks of Superſtition Yet when they pleaſe, they can poſe in an Ale-houſe, and lay hands (well quickned with angels) on Tapſters, Coblers, Butchers, and many ſuch, that are ſo farre from the ſmell of a Colledge, that they never ſaw an A. B. C. or Primer to purpoſe, much leſſe a *Ferula* in a Grammer School.

In the laſt place they ſolemnly profeſſe they are ready to hear or read, any that either by writing, preaching, or private diſcourſe ſhall inform them better than now they ſee or know. They would thank any man that will ſatisfie their conſciences, and convince their judgment: For, they profeſſe they are not acted by vain-glory, or faction, but conſcience, and deſire of propagating Truth, and ſpreading the Goſpell, as God ſhall give them opportunities.

And ſuppoſing ſuch parts, gifts, and abilities, fit for thoſe duties; They conceive no man may upbraid them with poverty, or former living in a trade; which yet they think not altogether incompatible to Preaching: for they have read of Saint *Paul* (and others) intermixing his Sermons with making of Tents.

Yea though they have not ſuch parts and gifts as S. *Paul*; yet they think the work of Preaching much more compatible with all works of the Hands, than with any one other ſtudy of the brain, or minde: and yet they ſee many *Civill Lawyers* take Livings, and have the Cure of Souls: Yea, and all their Lord Biſhops have Two Callings, Two ſeverall (oppoſite) ſtudies; and yet for all Thoſe two, They can ſpend as much, or more time at Cards and Dice (or worſe) than at either of their Callings.

Nor are they ſo tyed to their outward Callings, but if the

the Church ſhall think it fit, they are ready to give up all, and apply themſelves wholly to the ſtudy of Scriptures, and work of the Miniſtery.

In the mean time they follow their *Callings*, (not living idlely, or going up and down Tatling as Buſie-Bodies) but being diligent to ſerve God both with their hands, hearts alſo, yea and tongues too, if God ſhall call them, and give opportunity as well as abilities.

I would not be miſtaken by my Reader. All this time I am ſpeaking *Their words*, not *my own*; All that I deſire is, that they may have a fair Hearing, before they be ſeverely cenſured. And I move this the rather, becauſe they are ſtill ready to ſay, Moſt that condemn them never heard them: I could not but do what in me lyes, to remove This ſcandall.

It may be Expected I ſhould now ſhew my own Opinion; and anſwer all Theſe Things, which Thoſe poor men ſay for themſelves. But I muſt confeſſe I am already almoſt tyred with relating the Arguments of one part onely; ſo that I dare not ſet on the other.

Neither indeed do I think it needfull: Moſt of That which They ſay, being ſuch, that it is not like to do much hurt; and ſo I think it not needfull to refute it. What muſt be refuted, may much better be done by Others of better Parts, and ſounder judgements: for I know ſome that in One poor diſcourſe of *Truth*, are by their wit able to finde all the ſeventeen *Imellectuall Sinnes*; how much more in a diſcourſe of Error?

Onely by the way, I cannot but ſhew how weakly Theſe poor Preachers anſwer ſome ſtrong objections brought againſt them.

As This in the Firſt place: That by This Courſe, All Errors and Hereſies ſhall quickly come to be vented and maintained in the Church, when every man may Preach that *will* and what he will, without controul.

To This Argument, All their Anſwer, that I can remember, is This.

Firſt, that They maintain not, that Any man may Preach that *Will.* No; They ſay it muſt be One of Parts, Gifts, and Abilities fit for a Preacher; and that not onely in his owne fancie, but in the Judgment of many Godly men: Who (being many) are as like to be fit and able to judge of Abilities on Their Tryall, as any One Biſhops Chaplain; that yet uſeth to preſent to his Lord, after little or no poſing, One whom he never heard ſpeak, (much leſſe Preach or Pray) before he came for *Holy Orders.*

Secondly, they ſay, They maintain not, that any ſuch man (ſo Gifted and Called, being judged fit by the votes of many) may yet Preach *what he will.* No, they are as much limited, and kept within bounds, as if they were licenſed by the Biſhop.

For, if he Preach falſe Doctrine, either in matters of Church or State, they ſay the Biſhops Keyes, or at leaſt his Long Sword, may reach him as well in a Parlour, or ſome little Pulpit, as if he were a *Licentiate* in a Great Cathedrall. And if he Preach no falſe Doctrine, muſt he ſuffer (ſay they) for Preaching True?

It is true, No wiſe man living will blame (much leſſe puniſh or fine) a man that ſpeaks a good True Diſcourſe of *Law*, or *Phyſick*, though he be *Licentiate* in neither; But Theſe poor men conſider not, the Caſe is not the ſame in Preaching a True diſcourſe in Divinity. Yet let us give way, and they will ſpeak more.

Again they ſay, Suppoſe they did hold (which they do not) that Any man living might Preach that would, and what he would; yet perhaps there would not follow ſo great Inconvenience as ſome imagine.

For, All ſuch ſuppoſed Preachers are either *Wiſe* men or *Fools.* If *Wiſe*, they will Preach *Wiſely*, and ſo do *Good.* If *Fools*, *Fooliſhly*, and ſo do no *Hurt*, or at leaſt very little hurt: For, it is not for a *Fool* to broach an Hereſie, and maintain it, or ſpread it much. No, *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Arminius*, and ſuch, were men of the greateſt Parts, but ſet wrong.

Yea ſuppoſe ſome of theſe *Non-Licentiate* Preachers be men of the greateſt Parts poſſible, and ſo poſſible to become dangerous Hereticks; Doth the Hereſie ſpread it ſelf the more for

not

not being *Licenſed?* Might not This Great man do as much hurt (yea much more) if he were licenſed, than now he is not?

If any anſwer, It is True, He is like to do more hurt, if Licenſed; but therefore the Biſhop in wiſedome will not licenſe him.

They rejoyn: Firſt, it is probable One Biſhop in This caſe will ſhew more care and conſcience, than 20, or 30, good men in a Congregation, where This parted Man would preach?

But again, Suppoſe there be never a Good man (in all his Auditory;) or that all the Good men there, will not have care to ſuppreſſe This man from doing hurt: How ſhall, how can the Biſhop do This? How can he keep him from venting, and ſpreading his Hereſie?

Firſt, when this man comes for a Licence to the Biſhop, No man can tell how he means to preach, (when he is Licenſed) except the Biſhop perchance be a Prophet alſo, as well as a Prieſt and King?

Either he hath preached, (before his comming for This Licenſe) or he hath not. If he have not, No Biſhop can tell how he will preach; nor can any wiſe man living commend him to the Biſhop, as fit to make a good Preacher: ſince he that is the beſt Scholar living, and perhaps as good a man as any, yet may prove but an ill Preacher.

If he have preached before, and done well, without Licenſe. then it ſeems it is lawfull to preach without a Licenſe: for probation no doubt, (though moſt of late have denyed This.) But I ask, how long ſhall he be a Probationer? how many years, months, weeks? Though he preach ten good Sermons, no man can tell, but in the next he means to broach an Hereſie.

But alas Theſe poor men ſee not how weak all this is. For, Is it not eaſie for three or four men, or a Biſhops Chaplain to commend a man (be he Scholar, or Groom, or Butler, or what he will:) let the Biſhop without ſeeing or ſmelling This man, give him his bleſſing blind-fold, and ſeal him a *Licenſe*, What hurt is in all This? For if this man preach well, the Church will get good: if ill, cannot the Biſhop as ſoon pull him down again, as he ſet him up?

They anſwer, Suppoſe he may, (which is hard to ſuppoſe ſince,

ſince Orders once given, leave an *Indelible (Character)* why may not ten or twenty men, Good men in a Congregation, as well ſet up a man, and try how he will prove? For if well, it is well; he will doe good: If ill, theſe ten or twenty men can as eaſily pull him downe againe, as ſet him up.

Not ſo. For the Biſhop is ſtill a very wiſe, diſcreet, good, holy man; and being entruſted by the Church, will have a ſpeciall care, even more than a hundred others, to ſet up a good man, or elſe pull him quickly downe.

To this they yet anſwer, The Biſhop cannot tell how or what he preacheth when he hath ſet him up, (except he can be preſent in all places, at leaſt many at once, to heare all young Preachers, that he Licenſeth;) and therefore though he would pull him downe, yet he cannot, becauſe he cannot be ſtill preſent to heare him. Though he come once, twice, ten times, yet the Preacher may hold in all his Hereſie, till he ſee the Biſhop abſent, and ſometimes he muſt be abſent.

But may not the Congregation then goe and complaine to the Biſhop, if their Preacher doe amiſſe? and upon complaint the Biſhop will, may and muſt ſuppreſſe that error.

If he doe not (they ſay) they are ſtill where they were. But if he doe cenſure this Preacher, on the complaint of the Congregation; Either he ſees they complaine unjuſtly (and then he doth injuſtice in cenſuring upon an unjuſt complaint) or elſe hee muſt yeeld they complaine juſtly; and then he alſo grants, that this Congregation hath wiſdome enough to judge, whether a man preach well or ill; and if ſo, why may not the Congregation cenſure him for ill preaching, without complaint to one Biſhop?

Sed fruſtra fit per plura; quod fieri poteſt per pauciora. And ſo I leave this, and come to another great Queſtion, that is wont ſtill to be propounded to theſe poore *Non-Licenſed* Preachers.

It is this, why (if indeed they be fit, or ſeeme fit, or doe but think themſelves fit to be Miniſters, why then) do they not enter into *Orders*? or at leaſt preſent themſelves, ſhewing their deſire to be in Holy *Oiders*, if indeed they may be found fit for the Miniſtery, as they thinke themſelves? Why doe they halt between two? either let them ſerve the Church wholly, and

ſo

so be in Orders; or else let them forbear, and not meddle with dispensing of Holy Ordinances.

This seemed to me a very serious Question, and therefore I much desired to hear their Answers.

Some of them say, they know not yet whether they be worthy, or fit to take on them Those Greater Offices which follow Orders, onely they desire they may have leave, (as Probationers) to exercise, or keep Acts, before the Church; till the Church shall approve of them, and call them out (judging them faithfull) for higher employment, or generally to dispense all the Ordinances. In the mean time, They meddle only with such Ordinances, as they conceive not proper to Church Officers onely, but in some sort common to all Christians, yea to all men, as was said before.

Others say, they would gladly (with all their Hearts) be consecrated to God, and wholly give themselves up to his service and worship in the Ministry; but they are afraid to take *Orders*, as *Orders* are now conferred in This State. And yet in the mean time, they dare not abstain from Preaching, (where they have opportunity, and a Willing Auditory) lest they should detain the Truth, God hath revealed to them; and should be guilty of hiding their Talent in a Napkin. For they think they may do many things belonging (though not proper) to a Minister; though they be not, nor can be (as things now stand) in holy Orders. Their instance is *David*, who was a *King*, and of the Tribe of *Judah*, & so could be neither *Priest* nor *Levite*; yet they find King *David* often *Preaching*; else they understand not the meaning of Those Phrases, *Come hither, and I will shew you what God hath done for my poor soul*, and the like.

If these men in this be serious, and do not pretend Conscience, where it is some other Principle, that acts them to some low end: I cannot but much pity them; that if they be fit, they neither may be licensed, nor yet preach without License. But let us see why they dare not enter into *Orders*, and so be Licensed Ministers.

They answer, that they have not so much against *Orders* conferred by our Church, or the manner of conferring them, (though under some Bishops, This hath been very strange,

and not warrantable either by Law of God or man, they conceive) as they have in their judgement and conſciences, againſt the *Power* conferring them.

For they doubt not to affirme, that He (who ever he be) that taketh on himſelfe power, which the Scripture hath not given him, to appoint, dictate or command, any one Thing either in Doctrine or Diſcipline; though the Thing it ſelfe might poſſibly be good, yet He that ſo dictates, is *Antichriſtian*; encroaching on the *Regall* Office of *Chriſt*; and ſo a *Traytor* in Religion.

Now they dare not touch That, which (how Good ſoever in it ſelfe, yet) comes in Power and Virtue of an Antichriſtian Traytor. Yea though ſuch a one ſhould command them a Thing very lawfull in it ſelfe, (as to weare a black cloath) yet if He have not Commiſſion to command, from Scripture, they conceive He incurres a *Premunire* with God; becauſe he takes on him to doe that (as an Officer) for which he is not *fore-armed with lawfull authority*. In this caſe they think they ought not to obey Him ſo commanding: becauſe though the Thing in it ſelfe be lawfull to be done, yet they think him an unlawfull Commander, and ſo dare not obey; if for no other Reaſon, yet for This, that by obeying here, they ſhall betray not only their own Priviledges, (which yet are very precious) but alſo the Liberties and Priviledge of all the Subjects of Chriſt, even of the whole Church; ſo that they become Traytors to their ſpirituall Common-wealth.

They give This Inſtance in Civill Things. Suppoſe a Sheriffe, that is a lawfull Officer, come and command me to give him forty pound, of his owne head, without lawfull Authority to beck his command; they ſay, if in This caſe I give him forty ſhillings, I betray not only my owne priviledge (which perhaps I may doe) but alſo the whole Liberty of the Common-wealth, and ſo become (*in Re*) a Traytor to the State: though in it ſelfe it be lawfull to give forty ſhillings to any man that asks; yet now I muſt not doe it, becauſe This Officer commands it by unlawfull Authority, and ſo without Commiſſion.

Nor yet that they think it neceſſary to ſtay diſputing the Authority

Authority of a Commander, there where is no appearance of Ground for a doubt. But if once they see and know the command is grounded on no lawfull Authority; or do but really doubt whether the *Power commanding*, or the *Thing commanded* be lawfull: They conceive themselves bound to abstaine till their judgement be cleered, (which they professe to desire, and by all lawfull meanes to endeavour) lest while they doe, they be condemned in their owne consciences, because they doe not act in *Faith: and what is not of Faith is sinne.*

I must leave These Things to be discussed by men of better judgements. In the meane time I humbly desire againe I may not be mis-understood; for it is not in my thoughts to abet the least miscarriage in any one of these poore men: nor by any meanes to countenance any of them, in a way of exercising those Duties that are too high for their parts, and abilities which God hath given them. Yet if there be any of them that have extraordinary parts, and endowments of judgement, memory, and utterance; if God stirre up these to improve their Gifts to the best advantage, yet with all meeknesse and humility, I dare not condemne them till I heare them: for I know the Spirit of God is not tied to our Fancies, but yet the *Spirit of the Prophets is subject to the Prophets.*

I take not on me to warrant all the paths which some cut out to themselves: Yet I most affectionately entreat men not to contemne all things in those they now brand with their usuall staine of *Separatisme*; which phrase many use in such scorne, as if with one stab (of that Italian dagger) they could run through Body and Soule at once.

These whom they so brand, may maintaine some errors, may not carry on the truth in the glory of it; who is so pefect? but oft-times in the midst of thickest ore we finde the purest gold: discover their errors and reject them; but doe not refuse what is good, because they hold it forth but darkly: no truth can shine in its perfect lustre at the first: light is darknesse when it first appeareth.

Yet *Light* was on the first Creatures, and yet not perfected till the fourth Day, (and perhaps not fully then;) so was spirituall *Light* the beginning of *Reformation*, That *New Creation*;

yet it was not perfect at first dawning, but encreaseth still by degrees, till it have quite chased away darkneſſe, and there be no more Night. All men yeeld there must be an encreaſe of light in the world; Now whether that be more probable to be in *Doctrine* or *Diſcipline*, judge yee.

At the first Rising out of Popery, the Church-leſſe Church of the *Albigenſes*, and *Waldenſes*, (Holy Good men) began an admirable Reformation. This was much advanced by *Jerome* of *Prague*, and *John Hus*. *Luther* had many groſſe errours, yet must not loſe his place among theſe glorious Lights. After theſe appeareth *Calvin*, ſhining yet brighter both in Doctrine and Diſcipline. Since him our God hath raiſed up a more glorious Light among theſe Northerne Iles. And yet ſome went from us lately with a candle burning, brighter perhaps than ours; though it were lighted here. Thus Light dilating, and enlarging it ſelfe, ſeemeth to become more pure, more Light, more Glorious; and yet it ſeemes not to be Noone. The Light, ſtill, will, muſt, cannot but encreaſe; why then doe wee ſhut our eyes? Let it not bee ſaid of us, that Light came in & grew up among us, yet we would not uſe it (for we cannot but receive it) becauſe we loved darkneſſe.

But why doe I wonder? If theſe things which are by many held but ceremoniall or circumſtantiall truthes, are thus ſlighted, ſeeing the ſweet workings of the Spirit, Truths of a more glorious Nature, are not only under-valued, but oppoſed, even by thoſe who love Chriſt; it is a ſtrange thing, men call, men long for new things; and yet if any doe hold forth new and quicke actings of the Spirit, they fall under cenſure, of thoſe who forget that Text, Judge not, leſt ye be Judged. Thus many times, good men doe not only neglect, but abuſe light, yea, they doe both grieve and quench Gods Holy Spirit. A ſad caſe! and ſo are ſtill in ſome part carnall; and the Fleſh not only luſteth, but warreth againſt the Spirit.

We are too too apt to ſlight the ſweet breathings of Gods Spirit, which He is pleaſed to communicate to others when wee are deſtitute of the ſame Workings. Some Chriſtians are as it were wholly legall; they Faſt, they Pray, receive Sacraments, heare Sermons, pay every one his own, live inoffenſively:

offensively: This is well done, but This is not All; yet this they take for enjoying God in Christ Jesus. But alas! *Quantum distat ab illo*, How far from that is it? *Non est vivere, sed valere vita*, Life consists in being healthfull, and not barely in living. These men may well be saved hereafter, but in the mean time, they lose the sweetest part of their life here.

On the other side, if God please to communicate himself in any manner of sweetnesse, so that a man begins to taste and see how good Communion and acquaintance with God is; how easily it is interrupted by loose walking; how sweet it is when enjoyed; so that it ravisheth the soul, and filleth the whole Heart, that it cannot but flow out at the Lips, in sweet breathings of, for, and after God in Christ Jesus, God in Christ Jesus. This man is presently stained with a taint of *Madnesse*, and I know not what *Enthusiasme*. If one that hath tasted and experimentally found the sweetnesse of Peace of Conscience, and knows how unpossible it is to keep it, but by close walking with God; how easily it is broken; and how hardly it is made up again when broken: so that he is content to leave Friends, Living, Liberty, All, rather than to break his Peace, wound his Conscience, sin against God, in sinning against light, or acting against Doubts. O that man is beyond all Rule of Reason; He hath a Tang of Phrensie; one puft up with a spirit of self conceit; a Rank *Separatist*.

But sure it should not be so among Christians. Can we not dissent in judgment (specially in these lower points of *Discipline*, while we agree in *Doctrine*) but we must also disagree in *Affection*? A hard case!

I confesse there are many now that turn the Light of Truth, into a Life of loosnesse, vanity, and profaneness; and we are all too too prone to This. There are some *Enthusiasticks*, who profane the Spirit. This I would resist with all my might. But let not all suffer with the wicked. Some without warrant run away from their Callings, and take up a bare, empty, fruitlesse Profession of Christianity, without the least dramme of life or power; These men my soul hateth.

But when God shall so enlarge his Hand, and unveil his

face, that the poore creature is brought into communion and acquaintance with his Creator: steered in all his wayes, by his spirit; and by it carried up above shame, feare, pleasure, comfort, losses, grave, and death it selfe; Let us not censure such Tempers, but blesse God for them. So far as Christ is in us, we shall love, prise, honour Christ, and the least particle of his Image in others: For we never pro e our selves true members of Christ more, than when we embrace his members with most enlarged, yet straitest Affections.

To this end, God assisting me, my desire, prayer, endeavour shall still be, as much as in me lies, to follow peace and holinesse; and though there may haply be some little dissent betweene my darke judgement, weake conscience, and other Good men, that are much more cleare and strong; yet my prayer still shall be, to *keepe the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*. And as many as walke after this Rule, Peace I hope shall still be on them, and the whole Israel of God.

FINIS.

The Stationer to the Reader.

COurteous Reader, I have thought good to translate divers Passages of this Treatise into English, (when part of the sense is contained in the Latine Phrase, or expression) that they who are unlearned, may be able more fully to understand the meaning of what they read. Accept of my good intention, and Pardon me, both in that, by my English, I interrupt the smoothnesse of the Style; and also that I cannot so render the Latine, as to retain the elegancie and native beauty of the Authors expression. Farewell.